

KENNETH M. SETTON

THE PAPACY
AND
THE LEVANT
(1204–1571)



VOLUME I. The Thirteenth
and Fourteenth Centuries



THE PAPACY AND THE LEVANT

(1204–1571)

MEMOIRS OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
Held at Philadelphia
For Promoting Useful Knowledge
Volume 114

THE PAPACY AND THE LEVANT
(1204–1571)
Volume I
The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries

KENNETH M. SETTON

*Professor of History
The Institute for Advanced Study*

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
Independence Square · Philadelphia
1976

Copyright © 1976 by The American Philosophical Society
Reprinted 1991.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 75-25476
International Standard Book Number 0-87169-114-0
US ISSN 0065-9738

To Margaret

Οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἔργον ἀφιλότιμον
τοῖς πάλαι ἐνομίσθη σοφοῖς.

John Cinnamus, I,1.

PREFACE

THIS is the first of three volumes, the product of almost twenty years' effort and fourteen *voyages paléographiques* to Italian archives. The remaining two volumes, now nearly finished, will (I trust) make their appearance in due time. They were not easy to write, which is one of the reasons they are not easy to read, especially the first seven or eight chapters of the present volume. I have worked like a mosaicist—appropriate for one whose studies take him to Byzantium—fitting sometimes broken tesserae into their topical and chronological place. Over the years the writing has been done at the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Wisconsin, and the Institute for Advanced Study, and in Rome, in Venice, and at the Gennadeion in Athens. I have thus not always had access to the same edition of, for example, Raynaldus's *Annales ecclesiastici*, but I trust that my references in the footnotes are clear, and that my occasional use of different editions will cause the reader no inconvenience.

While working on these volumes, I have often thought (as I do now in jotting down this preface) of the shortness of human life and the transitory possession of power. The ups and downs of fortune depicted in this volume provide ample grounds for such reflections. As the historian clears away the snows of yesteryear, he opens up the approach to the hovels of the poor as well as to the palaces of the great. Entering their dwellings, reading their documents, he can often observe their personal hopes and fears, ambitions and frustrations, successes and defeats. The makers of history, great and small, are short-lived in every generation. Death soon overtakes them. And yet, whatever the disorder and violence of their lives, the historian can see them all in a grand procession. This I have sought to do. While I have not hesitated to expose the reader to a good deal of detail, always drawn from the sources and (after the thirteenth century) often from unpublished sources, I have tried not to lose sight of this panorama.

In addition to the main political and diplomatic concerns of this volume, which is essentially a history of the later crusades (to the year 1400), I have dealt in passing with various items—crusading propaganda, relevant ecclesiastical and feudal lawsuits, the postal service of the fourteenth century, social conditions in papal

Avignon, and even such trivia as fashions in footwear. Here and there I have been at pains to note the theological and intellectual differences which separated the Greek East from the Latin West as well as certain social changes which took place from one generation to the next. I could hardly resist depicting the needs and tastes of the times as shown by the shopping sprees of Amadeo VI of Savoy in Venice and Negroponte, Constantinople and Pera (in 1366–1367). Such matters of economic interest as papal finance, the costs of the later crusades, Mediterranean commerce, and Venetian shipping practices loom large in the following pages. Homely examples culled from the sources are usually more illustrative of the social life of the Latins in the Levant after the Fourth Crusade than generalizations drawn from modern assumptions. We perceive the Greek attitude toward the invaders when, shortly after the crusade, the peasants and townsmen of Gravia beat up Master Hugo, the Latin archdeacon of Daulia. The continued poverty of the Latin hierarchy in Greece is clear when, almost two centuries after the conquest, a titular bishop of Megara had to leave “a box full of books” with two Greek moneylenders as surety for the twenty ducats he had borrowed for the hire of two horses he needed.

In an era in which an accomplished scholar often confines his studies to a generation or a half century in the past, I can only ask the indulgence of such a specialist for the errors and oversights which my temerity has made inevitable. I have done the best I could, and have incurred many debts in the doing. Most of them are indicated in the footnotes. It is a pleasure, however, to express my indebtedness to Mons. Martino Giusti, the prefect, to Mons. Hermann Hoberg, the vice-prefect, and to Mr. Sergio Damiani of the Archivio Segreto Vaticano and to the always helpful archivists and officials of the Archivi di Stato of Florence, Mantua, Milan, Modena, Siena, and especially Venice, to the last of which archives I have made an almost annual pilgrimage for years.

I am happy to express my obligation to Dr. George W. Corner, the executive officer and editor, and to Miss Marie A. Richards, the associate editor, of the American Philosophical Society, for their assistance, and to Miss Margaret C. Nolan, Mrs. Loretta Freiling, Miss Susan

Babbitt, and Mrs. Jean T. Carver for typing or proofreading. Mrs. Carver has typed and retyped the final version of the entire manuscript and read the proofs of the entire volume.

To Dr. Harry W. Hazard, my fellow editor of *A History of the Crusades*, I am under especial obligation. He has read this and parts of the two following volumes, offered innumerable suggestions of fact, style, and organization, and performed the herculean task of making the Index. I only wish that our association of twenty-five years could have been half as profitable to him as it has been to me. My wife has read both the typescript and the proofs, and removed many an awkward expression. Dedication of the volume to

her is slight recognition of the time and effort she has expended on the text.

Among my larger debts are those which I owe the Institute for Advanced Study for the opportunity to continue my work with few interruptions and for a generous subsidy to help pay the costs of printing. I am most grateful also to the American Philosophical Society for undertaking the considerable task of publication.

The inadequacies of the work I claim for myself.

K. M. S.

Princeton, N.J.
15 March, 1976.

CONTENTS

1. Innocent III, the Fourth Crusade, and the Establishment of the Latin States in Greece	1
2. The Apogee of the Latin Empire under Henry of Hainaut (1206–1216)	27
3. The Changing Fortunes of Constantinople and Achaea, Epirus and Nicaea (1216–1246)	44
4. The Advance of Nicaea and the Decline of the Latin Empire (1246–1259)	68
5. Pelagonia, the Loss of Constantinople, and the Rise of the Angevins (1259–1268)	85
6. The Papal Interregnum, Gregory X, and the Second Council of Lyon (1268–1274)	106
7. The Holy See, Greek Opposition, and the Failure of Church Union (1276–1282)	123
8. The Sicilian Vespers and a Century of Angevin Decline (1282–1383)	140
9. The Avignonese Papacy, the Crusade, and the Capture of Smyrna (1309–1345)	163
10. Clement VI, Humbert of Viennois, and the End of the Smyrniote Crusade (1345–1352)	195
11. Pierre Thomas and Peter I of Cyprus, the Crusade and the Revolt of Crete (1352–1364)	224
12. The Sack of Alexandria and the Restoration of Peace with Egypt (1365–1370)	258
13. The Crusade of Amadeo VI of Savoy, John V Palaeologus in Rome and Venice (1366–1371)	285
14. The Crusades of Barbary (1390) and Nicopolis (1396)	327
15. Manuel II, Marshal Boucicaut, and the Clash between Venice and Genoa	370
16. The Athenian Church and Lordship under the Burgundians (1204–1308)	405
17. The Catalans and Florentines in Athens to the End of the Fourteenth Century	441
Index	475

1. INNOCENT III, THE FOURTH CRUSADE, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LATIN STATES IN GREECE

HISTORY seeks to preserve some record of a past which time destroys. The sources for the Crusades remain quite abundant, however, especially those for the highly controverted Fourth Crusade. Few movements have excited greater interest and disagreement than the Crusades, the causes of which are certainly easier to trace than the consequences. The religious motive was always strong; so too were the ambitions of landless younger sons. The crusaders' freedom from lawsuits, the cessation of interest on their debts, and the exemption from various taxes and tallages were important considerations. Piety, the tradition of pilgrimage, and the promised remission of sins could be reinforced by the prospect of gain and the love of adventure. Christian wrath was aroused by grim tales of the Turkish depopulation of lands of eastern Christians, the torture of pilgrims, the desecration of holy places, and the defilement of altars. Some of these tales were true.

War against the Moslems in Spain and Sicily was extended into the Crusade, which had as its background the growth in population, the desire of bellicose nobles to display their prowess against the infidel, the religiosity of the increasingly articulate masses, a reverence for Jerusalem as the distant but attainable heavenly city, and the Italian interest in establishing commercial centers in the Levant. The first crusades were partly the military expression of the Gregorian and later reform movements in the Church. As the impulse toward reform weakened, the Crusade became something of a convention, its appeal lessened, its force in some measure spent. But as Urban II had preached the First Crusade and his successors preached later ones, so the popes (understandably enough) tried for centuries to keep alive this device of their own construction, for it always remained the only solution they could find for the so-called eastern question. For some six centuries, from Bohemond to John Sobieski, Europeans thought of the Christian struggle against Islam in terms of the Crusade, evidence of papal domination over the minds of men. When the Protestant reformers fought against this domination, the Crusade became an exclusively Catholic responsibility. But, then, it had always been a Catholic responsibility.

We commonly regard the later crusades as social anachronisms: the times had changed, but the papacy had not changed with them. But is this appraisal either true or just? The fact is that the papacy, however slowly, has always managed to change with the times. Lepanto was not only a crusade; it was also successful. The eastern question changed from one period to another. Innocent III and his immediate successors undoubtedly saw the Fourth Crusade primarily from a religious standpoint, and took immense satisfaction in the prospect of concluding the long schism by conquest. The destruction of the Byzantine state, they hoped, would eventually bring about Greek recognition of papal primacy in Christendom. There had been trouble between Rome and Constantinople for centuries before the Cerularian schism of 1054. Particularly, the Byzantine imperial claim to universal temporal sovereignty (challenged by the popes' crowning of Charlemagne in 800 and of Otto I in 962) and the papal claim to universal spiritual authority (challenged by Photius at the time of the Ignatian controversy) had helped to divide Christendom into a Greek East and a Latin West. *Haec duo imperia, haec duo sacerdotia*. Discouragement soon followed Innocent's hopes of church union, however, and by the mid-thirteenth century, when the re-establishment of the Greeks in Constantinople seemed to be the most likely way of ending the schism, the popes were apparently prepared to preside over the funeral rites of the Latin empire which the Fourth Crusaders had erected. The popes now thought of yielding Constantinople to the Greek emperors of Nicaea in return for the union of the Churches and acknowledgment of the Roman primacy. But it was hard to sacrifice the great success of the Fourth Crusade.

On 13 November, 1204, Innocent III had written the Catholic clergy in the East that the transfer of imperial power in Constantinople from the Greeks to the Latins was "the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes."¹ His words were those of the psalmist (118: 23), and

¹ Innocent III, *Epp.*, an. VII, no. 154, ed. Theodosius Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III (1198-1216)*, Città del Vaticano, 1944, no. 65, p. 278 (in the *Fontes Pontificiae Commissionis ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici*

well reflected the astonishment felt in Europe at the wondrous achievement of the Fourth Crusaders. That wonder never ceased, and there was always disagreement in the Curia Romana when the celestial minds determining papal policy debated the issue of the Latin empire. The Venetians were not prepared to give up the advantageous position they had gained on the Bosphorus for the sake of church union, and the shock of the Greek recovery of Constantinople in 1261 was such that the popes were promptly driven to preaching the Crusade to restore the Latin empire to its erstwhile status under such good Latin Catholics as the families of Courtenay-Anjou and the merchants of Venice. In time the Venetians had to become reconciled to their loss, and papal efforts were finally expended to secure the union of the Churches in return for helping the Greeks to defend themselves against the Turks.

After 1453 it was always a question of halting the Ottoman advance westward in order to preserve the very existence of Christianity—even Orthodox Christianity—in the Balkans, Greece, and the harassed islands of the Aegean. But the Crusade became more than a matter of solving the Turkish problem, and of course in the period under review the popes were concerned about Italy. The popes have mostly put Italy first in their minds and hearts. After all, since the Avignonese period most of them have been Italian and they have lived in Italy. As Aeneas Sylvius observed to Cardinal Giovanni Castiglione during the conclave of August, 1458, "What is our Italy without the bishop of Rome? We have lost the empire, but we still have the apostolic see. . . ."²

In Italian politics from at least the beginning of the sixteenth century the Crusade came to have a special meaning in papal policy. Since the Curia Romana found it generally impossible to divert the rival houses of Valois and Haps-

burg from fighting their battles on Italian soil, it was obviously desirable for the popes to urge the Crusade upon the French, Spanish, and German rulers, whose forces might find a better employment against the Islamic infidel, *hostis nominis Christiani*, than in sacking Italian cities and ravaging the countryside.

The first three crusades and the two ill-fated expeditions of S. Louis have aroused much interest for centuries. Who would deny that they still arouse interest? The scheming rogues and mercenary adventurers of the Fourth Crusade have commonly been held up to opprobrium, for their various moves and machinations were not much impeded by the idealists among them. But men have not infrequently left an impress upon posterity in marked disproportion to the worthiness of their motives, and the identifiable results of the Fourth Crusade were longer lasting than those of any other such venture into the Levant.

The fall of Acre in 1291 brought an end to the crusades in Syria and Palestine. To be sure, crusaders would pillage Alexandria in 1365, but although much crusading propaganda was directed against the Mamluks in Egypt, the Turks of the Anatolian emirates and (after them) the Ottomans were the chief enemies of Latin Christendom in the Levant. Except for the events of 1365 the Mamluks will not figure prominently in the present account. With every passing decade, after the first great display of Ottoman power in Bithynia in 1301–1302,³

³ Geo. Pachymeres (1242–1310), *De Andronico Palaeologo*, IV, 25–26 (Bonn, II, 327–37). The Ottomans first met a Byzantine army, protecting the region of Nicaea, in 1302 (cf. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Les Origines de l'empire ottoman*, Paris, 1935, p. 124, and on the date of the battle, see Pia Schmidt, "Zur Chronologie von Pachymeres," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LI [1958], 85). The Byzantine historian Pachymeres was an older contemporary of Osman, founder of the new Turkish state in northwestern Asia Minor. The first Ottoman historical compilations, put together from tales (*menâqib*) and calendars, are a century and more older than Osman (d. 1326), and the most important general works of Ottoman historiography, for which the original sources are often no longer accessible to us, come as late as the early years of Sultan Bayazid II's reign (1481–1512), on which see the chapters on Ottoman historiography, by Halil İnalcık and V. L. Ménage, in Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, eds., *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962, pp. 152–79; cf. in general Ménage's instructive little monograph *Neshri's History of the Ottomans*, London, 1964.

The first hostile encounter of Byzantine and Ottoman forces on 27 July, 1302, "somewhere near Bapheus" (*περί του τὸν Βαφέα*), according to Pachymeres (Bonn, II, 327), has of course excited the attention of historians from Jos. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Gesch. d. osman. Reiches*, I (Pest,

Orientalis, 3rd ser., vol. II): "Sane a Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostris." This letter may also be found of course in Migne (*PL* 215, col. 456A).

² Pius II, *Commentarii*, bk. I, ed. Jos. Cugnoni, *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini Senensis qui postea fuit Pius II Pont. Max. opera inedita . . .*, in the *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, CCLXXX (1882–83), 3rd ser., *Memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, VIII (Rome, 1883), 503: "Et quid est nostra Italia absque Praesule? Retinemus Apostolatum, Imperio amisso . . ." and cf. the translation by Florence A. Gragg, *The Commentaries of Pius II*, with notes by Leona C. Gabel, in *Smith College Studies in History*, XXII, nos. 1–2 (1936–37), p. 99.

which was soon followed by the sacking of Tenedos, Chios, Samos, Carpathos, and even Rhodes by various Turkish pirates in 1303,⁴ Europeans as well as Byzantines fastened their eyes upon the ever-increasing danger of Turkish expansion beyond the confines of Asia Minor. If the Ottomans eventually moved against the Persians and (the time would come) against the Mamluks in Egypt, they also moved westward against Christendom, into lands distraught by generations of Graeco-Latin and Graeco-Slavic hostility, much of which was engendered by events preceding and following the Fourth Crusade, which is our starting point.⁵

1827, repr. Graz, 1963), 67–68, to Halil Inalcik, in Lewis and Holt, *op. cit.*, p. 153. A somewhat haphazard attempt to depict the social background of the rise of the Ottoman state may be found in Ernst Werner, *Die Geburt einer Grossmacht—die Osmanen (1300–1481): Ein Beitrag zur Genesis des türkischen Feudalismus*, Vienna, Cologne, and Graz, 1972, esp. pp. 93 ff., 117 ff.

⁴ Pachymeres, IV, 29 (Bonn, II, 344).

⁵ Many of the important sources of the thirteenth century have been discussed by Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz: Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergange des byzantinischen Reichs (1453)*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958. His book is awkwardly written, to be sure, and a few years after its appearance it was subjected to severe criticism by Johannes Haller, "Das Papsttum u. Byzanz," *Historische Zeitschrift*, XCIX (1907), 1–34. Haller criticizes Norden for poor grammar (*schlechtestes Zeitungsdeutsch*), numerous inaccuracies, the impudent as well as imprudent use of sources, arrogant generalizations, and the constant failure of sound interpretation (on the grounds that Norden assigns a purely political significance to the long-controverted question of church union, neglecting the important religious issues of dogma and ritual). Haller's obvious ire blinded him, however, to the striking merits of the book, which depicts with clarity and insight the political and diplomatic background to the numerous efforts of the Roman pontiffs and the Byzantine emperors to achieve the union of the Churches. But Haller might have noted the great opportunity which Norden missed by his very sparse treatment of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for despite the title Norden's book deals in detail only with the period from 1204 to 1282. As for *Zeitungsdeutsch*, Haller's style does not seem to represent much improvement over that of Norden. A more judicious review of *Das Papsttum u. Byzanz* is given by Ferd. Chalandon, *Revue de l'Orient latin*, X (Paris, 1904, repr. Brussels, 1964), 468–72. For other reviews of Norden's book, see *ROL*, X (1903–4, repr. 1964), 524, and *ibid.*, XI (1905–8), 560, and cf. Angelo Pernice, "Il Papato e Byzanzio . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th ser., XLII (1908), 241–58. In recent years Norden's views of the thirteenth century have been expanded and various issues more closely examined in periodical and monographic studies by more than a dozen scholars whose names come immediately to mind.

Although the fourteenth-century sources for the history of Graeco-Latin relations are more abundant than those of the thirteenth century, they still seem to arouse less general

The later twelfth century was a time of violent change and ferment in the Balkans. The Serbs were establishing a state which, a century and a half later, the energetic Stephen Dushan was to elevate to a position of great power, and the Bulgars were embarking on the history of the Second Bulgarian Empire, which was to prove a most formidable enemy to the new Latin empire of Constantinople and to exhaust the Fourth Crusaders' strength on the Bosphorus in the three decades which followed the conquest. A presage of things now coming, there was already a Latin state in the Ionian Greek islands of Cephalonia and Zante, where young Matteo Orsini of Apulia had set up a county that was long to survive and play a most conspicuous role in the history of Latin dominion in Greece. Orsini had married the daughter of the prominent admiral Margaritone of Brindisi, who had ruled the islands under Sicilian suzerainty from the time of William II's expedition against Greece in 1185, which had resulted in the temporary occupation of Durazzo and the tragic sack of Thessalonica. The Latins were no strangers to the Byzantine empire, nor was the empire strange to them. Under the Comneni many warriors from the West had sought and found their fortunes in lands ruled by the Byzantine emperor. The Latins knew well the manifold weaknesses of Byzantium. Centrifugal forces were pulling the empire to pieces. The contemporary historian Nicetas Choniates has written, with sadness, of those two decades of Byzantine history during which the Angeli ruled (1185–1204) that "there were those who revolted in one place or another, again and again, and it is not possible to say how many times this happened."⁶

At the same time it seemed almost as though the West were in training to exploit the weak-

interest although here again the informed reader can think of almost a score of writers of invaluable books and articles. Despite its rhetorical dismissal by some historians, the Crusade was still important in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and in the present work we shall be much concerned with this later period. Since lines must be drawn and exclusions made somewhere to prevent this work from becoming too large, less attention will be given to the Holy Land, Cyprus, and Egypt (except for the Alexandria Crusade of 1365). Sir George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vols. II–III [1192–1571], Cambridge, 1948, has dealt extensively with the one while various orientologists and others are outlining the history of Egypt and the Holy Land in the co-operative *History of the Crusades*.

⁶ Nicetas Choniates, *De Isaacio Angelo*, III, 2 (Bonn, p. 553), and cf. Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 292 ff.

ness of the East. On 8 January, 1198, Lotario de' Conti of Segni, a native of Anagni, a young man and a strong one, was elected pope. He took the name Innocent III, and began one of the more brilliant reigns in the long annals of papal history.⁷ Apostolic authority was quickly re-established in Rome and in central Italy. The power of the Hohenstaufen had almost collapsed with the sudden death of the Emperor Henry VI, soon followed by that of his wife Constance of Sicily, and when Innocent III became the guardian of their little son, Frederick [II], the kingdom of Sicily was once more recognized as a papal fief.⁸ Dear to Innocent's heart was the idea of a crusade which should recover Jerusalem, lost to Saladin in 1187, and not recovered by the Third Crusaders, for all the prowess of the Lion Heart. With the passing of the astute Henry VI from the scene, however, Ghibelline policy—or rather what the next generation would call Ghibelline policy—had foundered in the Levant as well as in Europe. The Byzantine Emperor Alexius III Angelus (1195–1203) quickly saw an ally in the new pope, whose enemies were his own, and with whom he now entered into a prolonged correspondence (1198–1202), but it was not within the power of Alexius III to effect either the union of the Churches or the recovery of Jerusalem, which were the chief objectives Innocent sought in any papal-Byzantine alliance. Although the pope and the emperor had common enemies, and nothing makes for understanding quite like the possession of common enemies, Innocent and Alexius did not draw together. The Byzantine Church was opposed, as it had been for centuries, to Roman claims to primacy, and in Europe, especially in Italy, there were other forces working adroitly and, as time would show, successfully to prevent any rapprochement between Rome and Constantinople.⁹ The

purpose of Alexius III was, like that of Michael VIII three-quarters of a century later, to prevent the armed might of the West from being organized for an attack upon the now diminished strength of that once great city on the Bosphorus.

Among the enemies whom Innocent III and the Byzantine Emperor Alexius possessed in common was the genial Philip of Swabia, brother of the late Henry VI, both of them sons of the famed Barbarossa. In 1195 Philip had married Irene, daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelus (1185–1195), whom his usurping brother Alexius III had driven from the throne, blinded, and imprisoned. But Isaac's son, also named Alexius [IV], had finally managed to escape and find a refuge in Italy, probably in 1201,¹⁰ and was now seeking the support of the

the Emperor Alexius III and Innocent], in *PL* 214; cf. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 133–43, and also his short study of *Der Vierte Kreuzzug im Rahmen der Beziehungen des Abendlandes zu Byzanz*, Berlin, 1898, together with Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 19 ff. On the Byzantine patriarch Camaterus's rejection of Innocent III's declaration of the primacy of the Roman See, note A. Papadakis and Alice Mary Talbot, "John X Camaterus Confronts Innocent III: An Unpublished Correspondence" [1198–1200], *Byzantinoslavica*, XXXIII (1972), 26–41, with the text of two letters of Camaterus. Vitalien Laurent has set forth the reasons, as he sees them, for the apparent vagaries of papal policy with respect to Byzantium during the dozen or so years before Innocent's accession, the period of the Third Crusade and of Henry VI's vaunting ambition ("Rome et Byzance: Sous le pontificat de Célestin III [1191–1198]," *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIX [1940], 26–58).

In connection with Laurent's article, see Jean Darrouzès, "Les Documents byzantins du XII^e siècle sur la primauté romaine," *Revue des études byzantines*, XXIII (1965), 42–88, and Georges et Démétrius Tornikès, *Lettres et discours*, Paris, 1970, epp. 30, 33–34, pp. 325–53, letters addressed to the Roman pontiff by George Tornikes, metropolitan of Ephesus, in the name of the Emperor Manuel (in 1156), and by George's younger brother Demetrius, logothete of the dromos, on behalf of the Emperor Isaac Angelus and the patriarch of Constantinople (in 1193): The letter written in the patriarch's name explicitly rejects the Roman claim to primacy, "for [except possibly for Jerusalem] no church is the mother of any other church" (*ibid.*, p. 349: μήτηρ γὰρ οὐδεμία ἐκκλησία ἐκκλησίας ἐτέρας ἐστίν).

¹⁰ On which note Henri Grégoire, "The Question of the Division of the Fourth Crusade," *Byzantion*, XV (1940–41), 158–66, who opposes the theory of the fortuitous development of events leading to the capture of Constantinople as found in Villehardouin, whose integrity as an historian is defended by his editor, Edmond Faral, "Geoffroy de Villehardouin: La Question de sa sincérité," in the *Revue historique*, CLXXVII (1936), esp. pp. 548 ff. The problem has been debated to the point of tedium, but if the appearance of the pretender Alexius IV in Italy is to be put in the year 1202, it is difficult to understand how, with so short a time at their disposal, the Swabian party could have persuaded the

⁷ Aug. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* [from 1198 to 1304], 2 vols., Berlin, 1874–75, I, pp. 1–2 and ff., where month by month, and often day by day, the official career of Innocent may be followed.

⁸ See the *Gesta Innocentii PP. III*, chaps. XXI–XXII ff. (in *PL* 214, cols. XXXI–XXXVIII ff.). The *Gesta* were written at the court of Innocent III by an anonymous curial official, who appears to have had access to the papal archives and to have finished his text between June and August, 1208 (cf. Franz Ehrle and Hermann Egger, *Der Vatikanische Palast in seiner Entwicklung bis zur Mitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*, Città del Vaticano, 1935, p. 33, with refs. [Studi e documenti per la storia del Palazzo Apostolico Vaticano, vol. II]).

⁹ See the *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. XLVI [for the launching of the Fourth Crusade], and chaps. LX ff. [for the relations of

Hohenstaufen to regain the throne his house had acquired with the fall of the Comneni (in 1185). Since the beginning of the year 1201, Innocent had been opposing Philip of Swabia's imperial ambitions in the West and supporting

leaders of the host to attack Constantinople in order to put the young pretender and his father back upon the Byzantine throne. The texts themselves, however, suggest the arrival of Alexius IV in the west sometime in 1201, as noted by Leopoldo Usseglio (1851–1919), *I Marchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XII e XIII*, 2 vols., Turin, 1926, II, 186–99, who thus dates Alexius's escape from Constantinople in 1201, and traces in detail the part played by Boniface of Montferrat in the events of 1201–1202 (with some criticism of the views of Cerone, Riant, and others). Alexius IV escaped from Constantinople on a Pisan ship (Nicetas Choniates, *De Alexio Isaacii Angeli fratre*, III, 8, in Bonn edition, pp. 710–12, and cf. the *Chronista Novgorodensis*, in Charles [Karl] Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 93–94). Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 31, seems content to date the arrival of Alexius IV in Italy in 1202, as is A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, Wisc., 1952, p. 457 (following the view of V. G. Vasilievskii). Like Faral, Roberto Cessi, "Venezia e la Quarta Crociata," *Archivio veneto*, XLVIII–XLIX (1951), 1–52, strongly supports the *théorie du hasard*, maintaining that the diversion of the Fourth Crusade was the consequence of unplanned developments. Cessi, *La Repubblica di Venezia e il problema adriatico*, Naples, 1953, p. 264, regards this article as one "nel quale è stato sottoposto a radicale revisione tutto il problema," which is an overstatement. Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, I (Gotha, 1905), 480 ff., analyzes the sources and also subscribes to the "théorie du hasard" (*Zufallstheorie*). Nevertheless, a plot is possible, even probable, although the extant diplomatic correspondence of the age is insufficient for us to be certain (cf. the observations of Robert Lee Wolff, "The Fourth Crusade," in Kenneth M. Setton et al., eds., *History of the Crusades*, II [Philadelphia, 1962; 2nd ed., Madison, Wisc., 1969], 168–73).

The Soviet historian M. A. Zaborov, "Papstvo i zachvat Konstantinopolya krestonostsami v načale XIII v." ["The Papacy and the Capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders at the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century"], *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, n.s., V (1952), 152–77, and "K Voprosu o predistorii četvertogo krestovogo pochoda" ["On the Question of the Preliminaries to the Fourth Crusade"], *ibid.*, n.s., VI (1953), 223–35, believes that, while Innocent III preserved appearances by pious statements, he connived at the attack upon Zara, and must share in the responsibility for the crusaders' extraordinary aberration in attacking Constantinople. Cf. in general the essay of A. Frolow, *Recherches sur la déviation de la IV^e Croisade vers Constantinople*, Paris, 1955, and the recent article by Donald E. Queller and Susan J. Stratton, "A Century of Controversy on the Fourth Crusade," in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, VI (1969), 235–77, who summarize the views of Hopf, Winkelmann, Riant, Tessier, Norden, Cessi, etc., and those of Paul Alphandéry. Given the broad scope and complicated nature of the operations which led to the Latin seizure of Constantinople, chance was undoubtedly a prominent factor throughout, but the question remains whether the diversion of the crusade was not in fact the consequence of long-range planning.

Otto [IV] of Brunswick against him. Months before the crusaders, whom Innocent had called to arms, had been assembled (or interned) on the island of S. Niccolò di Lido in Venice, Philip had been trying to employ them on behalf of the exiled Angeli, who were after all members of his wife's family. Fate conspired with Philip to frustrate the intentions of the pope. The leaders of the Fourth Crusade resembled those of the First in two important respects: they included no monarchs among them, and they established enduring states in an alien land.

Everyone knew that the Venetians and the Byzantines had long entertained the heartiest dislike for each other. Despite the famous grant of trading privileges made by Alexius I Comnenus to the Venetians in May, 1082 (or 1092?),¹¹ or rather because of it, there had been intermittent strife between the Venetians and the Byzantines for generations, especially during the years 1122–1126, 1147–1148, and 1171–1179, and Manuel I, although finally forced to renew the Venetian privileges, had extended them also to the Genoese, Pisans, and Anconitans.¹² The

¹¹ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–57, repr. Amsterdam, 1964 (*Fontes rerum austriacarum*, pt. II: *Diplomataria et acta*, vols. XII–XIV), I, 43–54, and cf. Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge: Le Développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII^e–XV^e siècles)*, Paris, 1959, pp. 35–39. On 1092 rather than 1082 as the date of Alexius I's grant of trading and other privileges to the Venetians, see André Tuilier, "La Date exacte du chrysobulle d'Alexis I^{er} Comnène en faveur des Vénitiens et son contexte historique," *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*, new ser., IV (1967), 27–48.

¹² Tafel and Thomas, I, 95–98, 109–24, 150–67, with citation of various Venetian and Byzantine sources, and cf. John Cinnamus, *Epitome rerum*, III, 5, 6; IV, 14; V, 9; and VI, 10 (Bonn, pp. 98 ff., 170, 228 ff., 280–81 ff.); Nicetas Choniates, *De Manuele Comneno*, II, 2, 5; V, 9 (Bonn, pp. 103, 113–15, 222–26); W. Regel, ed., *Fontes rerum byzantinorum*, I-1 (S. Petersburg, 1892), 36, 109, and I-2 (1917), 219; also F. Chalandon, *Les Comnène*, II (Paris, 1912), 585–93, Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer* (1966), pp. 231–33, 246, 255–63, and esp. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, pp. 40–54. The Venetian privileges were renewed in 1187 and 1198–1199 (Tafel and Thomas, I, 178–203, 246–80), but by that time the vulnerability of the Byzantines had become too apparent for the Venetians not to seek some final satisfaction (Thiriet, *op. cit.*, pp. 60–62). On the imperial chrysobulls granted to the Venetians before the Fourth Crusade, see Horatio F. Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the Close of the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XL (1920), 68–88. Brown's plan of the Venetian Quarter on the southern shore of the Golden Horn has been improved in recent years, on which see Raymond Janin, *Constantinople byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris, 1950, pp. 237–39 (with map no. 1 at the end of the

Venetians resented these new competitors along the shores of the Bosphorus, and the seeds of the Fourth Crusade were planted in the soil of their discontent. Whether or not the Venetians deliberately sought the diversion of the Crusade from Egypt and the Holy Land to Constantinople, they certainly did not set out upon the great enterprise with the political ambitions of Frederick Barbarossa and his son Henry VI. They were primarily merchants, and what they chiefly wanted was the security of their trade in the East. They not only found the Byzantine government unreliable to deal with (as the events of the 1120's and the 1170's had shown), but they also found a constant source of danger in the very weakness of that government. It made little difference that Isaac II Angelus was friendly to them and his brother Alexius III inimical. The Greek people were heartily opposed to the Venetians. The imperial government counted for less and less, and its debility threatened every merchant of Venice in Byzantine territory.

The Venetians agreed in April, 1201, to transport the Fourth Crusaders to Egypt by sea, and when Egypt had been taken, the road to Jeru-

salem would lie open:¹³ "si fu la chose teüe que on iroit en Babilloine," says Villehardouin, "porce que par Babilloine poroient miels les Turs destruire que par altre terre. . . ."¹⁴ According to the well-informed author of the *Gesta Innocentii*, who wrote of course some time after the event, Innocent III was less than elated by the agreement: "When the Franks and the Venetians had formed this partnership [*societas*], both sides sent envoys to the apostolic see at the same time, requesting the supreme pontiff to confirm the pacts they had made between them for the relief of the Holy Land. But he, with some foreboding as to the future [*futurorum . . . praesagiens*], cautiously replied that he believed the agreements would have to be confirmed with the reservation that the allies should inflict no injury on Christians, unless by chance these latter should wrongfully impede their passage or unless some other just and necessary cause should arise which would leave them no alternative, assuming the assent of the legate of the apostolic see."¹⁵

volume), and *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, pt. I: *Le Siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, vol. III: *Les Églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1953), pp. 583-85 (also with map no. 1 at the end of the volume). In general see also Stefano Borsari, "Il Commercio veneziano nell'impero bizantino nel XII secolo," *Rivista storica italiana*, LXXVI (Naples, 1964), 982-1011, with an excellent coverage of both the sources and the secondary literature. The churches in the possession of the Latins in Constantinople had an especial significance as the major social institution around which life devolved in the various Italian colonies on the Bosphorus (on which note R. Janin, "Les Sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine [1204-1261]," *Revue des Études byzantines*, II [1944], 134-84, and "Les Sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople," *ibid.*, IV [1946], 163-77, which deals briefly with the period both before and after 1204).

Tafel and Thomas, I, 286 ff., and III, 452 ff., have assembled the chief (Latin) sources for the Fourth Crusade, which moved a Russian annalist to one of the longest entries in the *Chronicle of Novgorod* (1016-1471), trans. Robert Michell and Nevill Forbes, Camden Society, 3rd ser., XXV (London, 1914), 43-48. The events long fascinated the Venetian chroniclers (cf. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XII-1 [Bologna, 1938-48], 278-80, 367), who in the seventeenth century were still discussing the capture of Constantinople, and of course the modern literature increases every year (cf. Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne* [1959], pp. 63-79; R. L. Wolff, "The Fourth Crusade," in K. M. Setton et al., eds., *History of the Crusades*, II [1962], 153-85; and D. M. Nicol, "The Fourth Crusade," etc., in *Cambr. Med. History*, IV, pt. 1 [1966], 275 ff.).

¹³ The text of the agreement is given in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. XCII, pp. 362-68, and repeated, *ibid.*, doc. XCIII, pp. 369-73. It is also given, with some account of its textual history, in Jean Longnon, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin*, Paris, 1939, doc. 59, pp. 177-81 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, no. 276). Cf. the *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. LXXXIII (PL 214, col. CXXXIBC); Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, pars. 12-30, ed. Edmond Faral, 2 vols., Paris, 1938-39, I, pp. 16-30 (Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge); Dandolo, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1201, *RISS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 276. The Venetians agreed, as is well known, to transport the crusaders on condition that they were paid "for each horse four marks [on the silver standard of Cologne], and for each man two marks," which came, considering the size of the proposed army (which fell far short of the crusaders' expectations), to 85,000 marks of silver (on which see Faral, *Revue historique*, CLXXVII, 533-37). Cf. Andrea Moresini [sic], *L'Imprese et espédition di Terra Santa*, etc., Venice, 1627, p. 103, and see especially L. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (1926), 176-78, 194 ff. For the total sum owing to Venice for transport, *octoginta quinque milia marcarum puri argenti ad pondus Colonie, quo utitur terra nostra*, see the text of the contract in Longnon, *op. cit.*, p. 180. On the amounts of money involved and the assumed numbers of crusaders, see Benjamin Hendrickx, "À propos du nombre des troupes de la Quatrième Croisade et de l'empereur Baudouin I," *Byzantina*, III (Thessaloniki, 1971), 31-41.

¹⁴ Villehardouin, *Conquête*, par. 30, ed. Faral, I, 30.

¹⁵ *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. LXXXIII (PL 214, col. CXXXIBC). The possible implications of this passage have induced some controversy, concerning which see Donald E. Queller, "Innocent III and the Crusader-Venetian Treaty of 1201," *Medievalia et humanistica*, XV (1963), 31-34, and Eric John, "A Note on the Preliminaries of the Fourth Crusade," *Byzantion*, XXVIII (1958), 102-3.

As the crusade was getting under way, Alexius Angelus went in person to the pope, conceivably in the late fall of 1201, and tried to win him over to his cause, recounting the evils his father and he had suffered at the hands of the Emperor Alexius III, but Innocent would not accept his claims to imperial legitimacy because his father, Isaac II, had not inherited the throne, and Alexius himself had been born before his father's accession. Innocent had had, moreover, quite enough of the arrogant demands of those who felt that they should have inherited empires, and was even then, as he wrote Alexius III (on 16 November, 1202), excluding Philip of Swabia from the western throne: "For if Philip had obtained the German empire, many tribulations would have come upon you from his imperial power, since he could easily have launched an attack upon your empire through the territory of our dearest son in Christ, Frederick, illustrious king of Sicily, his nephew, just as his brother, the Emperor Henry [VI], had once proposed to occupy your empire by way of Sicily."¹⁶ Innocent, however, had lost all control over the crusade.

The nobles of northern France had recognized young Count Theobald III of Champagne as leader of the crusade, without papal permission, when they took the cross at the tournament at Écry-sur-Aisne in late November, 1199,¹⁷ but Theobald died in May, 1201, just after the agreement was signed with Venice for the transport of the crusaders overseas. When Duke Odo of Burgundy and Count Theobald of Bar refused to succeed Theobald, a baronial parliament met at Soissons in June, 1201, and elected the redoubtable Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, whose brother Conrad had once been king of Jerusalem (1190–1192), to lead them into those distant lands that his family had known so well. Boniface was a distinguished figure in his day, patron of the troubadours Gaucelm Faidit, Élias

Cairel, and especially of Raimbaud de Vaqueiras, who was much devoted to him; he was related by marriage to the royal family of France and to the Hohenstaufen also; and he was, as his father had been before him, the leader of the so-called Ghibelline party in northern Italy, which could not have recommended him to the pope's esteem. Boniface made his way to France with considerable dispatch, in response to the crusaders' election of him as their leader. On 16 August, 1201, he took the cross himself in the Church of Our Lady of Soissons, and on 14 September he was acclaimed leader of the crusade at the chapter general of the great monastery of Cîteaux.¹⁸ Upon leaving France, Boniface sought Philip of Swabia, whom he found at Hagenau in Alsace on Christmas day of 1201, and the contemporary author of the *Gesta Innocentii* declares that the purpose of this meeting was believed to be the diversion of the proposed crusade to Constantinople to restore the Angeli to the "empire of Romania." In the spring of 1202 Boniface was in Rome, we are informed, seeking Innocent's consent to the restoration of the Angeli by the crusaders, "but when he perceived that the pope's mind was not turned in this direction, he finished the business pertaining to the crusade, and went back to his home."¹⁹

The crusaders converged upon Venice in the midsummer of 1202, and in September emissaries from Philip of Swabia were also in Venice, requesting the crusaders to win back the eastern

¹⁶ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. V, no. 122 (PL 214, 1123–25: 1125A); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. xcvi, p. 406; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 1763 (vol. I, p. 154); cf. *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. LXXXII (PL 214, cols. cxxx–cxxxii); Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1202, nos. 35–37, ed. J. D. Mansi, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), pp. 135–37. Most of Innocent III's letters relating to eastern affairs have been reprinted by Theodosius Haluščynskij, ed., *Acta Innocentii PP. III (1198–1216)*, Città del Vaticano, 1944, sometimes with incorrect dates.

¹⁷ E. John, ". . . Preliminaries of the Fourth Crusade," *Byzantion*, XXVIII (1958), 95–103, would put the tournament as Écry as early as November, 1198. Today Écry-sur-Aisne is called Asfeld, in the Ardennes, arrondissement of Rethel.

¹⁸ On Cistercian activity in the Fourth Crusade, see Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "The Cistercians in the Latin Empire of Constantinople and Greece, 1204–1276," *Traditio*, XIV (1958), esp. pp. 67–78. The letter, or perhaps letters, which the crusaders sent from Soissons to invite Boniface of Montferrat to assume command of the host (Villehardouin, *Conquête*, par. 42, ed. Faral, I, 42) is one of the many lost documents relating to the Fourth Crusade, the existence of which is known from mention or citation in the narrative sources. Cf. Benjamin Hendrickx, "Les Chartes de Baudouin de Flandre . . .," *Byzantina*, I (Thessaloniki, 1969), 76–78, and see his "Recherches sur les documents diplomatiques non conservés, concernant la Quatrième Croisade et l'empire latin de Constantinople pendant les premières années de son existence (1200–1206)," *ibid.*, II (1970), 111–81.

¹⁹ *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. LXXXIII (PL 214, col. cxxxiii); Norden, *Papsttum u. Byzanz* (1903), p. 144; and see, in general, David Brader, *Bonifaz von Montferrat bis zum Antritt der Kreuzfahrt (1202)*, Berlin, 1907, and note the chronology of events on pp. 237–38; Hermann Moeser, *Gottfried von Ville-Hardouin* (diss. Univ. Bern), Breslau, 1897, pp. 34 ff. Note, however, Faral, *Revue historique*, CLXXVII (1936), 547–48. On the background, see L. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II, esp. pp. 179 ff., 189 ff.

empire for the dispossessed Angeli. Sorely tempted by Philip's promises, it would seem, the crusaders sent their spiritual adviser, the cardinal legate Peter Capuano, to lay the matter before Innocent, who was also called upon to receive envoys from the Emperor Alexius III. Innocent rejected the proposal Philip had made to the crusaders, and affirmed his continued recognition of Alexius III, who was to secure therefor the obedience and devotion of the Greek Church to the papacy. We know of these events from Innocent's letter to Alexius III, dated 16 November, 1202, which we have already had occasion to cite, a most important source for the history of the prelude to that dismal drama wherein was to be enacted the fall of a greater city than Troy and to a host less great than the fair-haired Achaeans.²⁰

As the autumn of 1202 approached, the crusaders were unable to pay the Venetians (who threatened to cut off their supplies) some 34,000 marks still due for their transport overseas. The old Doge Enrico Dandolo proposed that they secure a postponement of their debt by attacking Zara, on the opposite coast of the Adriatic, which had been occupied by King Emeric I of Hungary. The Doge Enrico now took the cross himself in the Church of S. Mark, and to the consternation of Innocent III, and probably to the exasperation of Boniface of Montferrat, who was pro-Genoese, the crusaders under Venetian direction took the city of Zara after a five days' siege in the middle of November. A month later Boniface himself appeared in Zara, and only now assumed his position as leader of the host. When the news of the fall of Zara reached Innocent III, "no little did he grieve and was he moved. . . ." He wrote the crusaders, "You are not like unto one going to Jerusalem, but rather one descending into Egypt: and verily you have fallen in with thieves." They were to repair the wrong they had done in Zara, and to do no more: otherwise they would fall under the ban of excommunication.²¹ But what had been done,

the Venetians would not allow to be undone, and the crusaders found themselves under excommunication. From that burden of anxiety only the papal authority could rescue them, but this must wait upon their penitence and their obedience to that authority.²² The crusade was indeed getting off to a bad start. The crusaders had too many leaders at odds with one another, the pope, Boniface, the doge, and the baronial council; and many a lowly Thersites in the army and the fleet must have uttered the classic complaint of those who are led by too many leaders.

The crusaders had not yet received papal absolution—which had, however, been requested and was soon forthcoming—for their attack upon Zara when new proposals were made to them by envoys of Philip of Swabia on behalf of the young Alexius Angelus. After prolonged discussions, in which Boniface of Montferrat upheld the cause of Alexius and the Hohenstaufen, an agreement was reached in January, 1203, to which the Doge Enrico Dandolo readily gave his consent, whereby the crusaders undertook the restoration of Alexius and his father to the throne. The Angeli, on their side, bound themselves to effect the submission of the Byzantine Church to Rome, to give the crusaders 200,000 marks, to send ten thousand men with them "into the land of Babylon" [Egypt], and to maintain throughout the lifetime of Alexius a force of five hundred knights in Palestine.²³

The destruction of the Greek empire and its replacement by a Latin regime in Constantinople had not yet, presumably, occurred even to the leaders of the crusade, who looked forward however to the fulfillment of the very considerable promises made to them by Alexius Angelus. In April, 1203, Alexius appeared, briefly, in the crusaders' camp at Zara, just before the departure of the doge and Boniface for Durazzo, which quickly surrendered. The curtain was rising on the drama. After a further stop of some three weeks on the island of Corfu, where Alexius now joined the host for good, the crusaders set sail for Constantinople on 24 May.

²⁰ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. V, no. 122 (PL 214, 1123–25), also in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. xcvi, pp. 404–7; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 1763 (vol. I, p. 154); Norden, *Papsttum u. Byzanz*, pp. 145–46.

²¹ Inn. III, an. V, ep. 161 (PL 214, 1178–79); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. c, pp. 407–9; Villehardouin, *Conquête de Constantinople*, pars. 62–63, 80–85, ed. Edm. Faral, I, 64, 66, 80 ff.; Robert de Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, pars. xii ff., ed. Ph. Lauer, Paris, 1924, pp. 11 ff. (Classiques français du moyen-âge); *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. LXXXV (PL 214, col. CXXXIXA); and on the whole affair, see A.

J. Andrea and Ilona Motsiff, "Pope Innocent III and the Diversion of the Fourth-Crusade Army to Zara," *Byzantinoslavica*, XXXIII (1972), 6–25.

²² Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. V, no. 162 (PL 214, 1179–81), also in Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. ci, pp. 409–11. Cf. Inn. III, an. VI, nos. 99, 100 (PL 215, 103–5), also in Tafel and Thomas, I, docs. cii, ciii, pp. 411–14.

²³ Villehardouin, *Conquête*, par. 93, ed. Faral, I, 92, 94; cf. Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. cxi, p. 431; L. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II, 211 ff.

Warned by the papal legate, Innocent wrote on 20 June to Boniface of Montferrat and Baldwin of Flanders absolutely forbidding, again under penalty of excommunication, the venture upon which they had already embarked against the Greek empire and its emperor: "but rather give up these sorry undertakings and pretended necessities, and go on to the rescue of the Holy Land; avenge the [Moslem] insult to the Cross; take from your enemies the spoils you needs must seize from your own brethren, as it were, if you thus stay in the lands of Romania."²⁴ At the same time Innocent wrote the crusaders that, although the doge of Venice, *dominus navium*, and his subjects lay under ban of excommunication, the journey to Egypt or Palestine might still be made in Venetian ships (indeed, they had no other ships), but on their arrival overseas the crusaders were not to fight the Lord's battle in company with the Venetians, lest they be defeated and lose their lives to no purpose.²⁵ The pope's efforts were all too late and all in vain, for, once the fleet had set sail for the eastern capital, events moved rapidly, relentlessly, to the final scenes of that tragedy which Nicetas Choniates and Nicholas Mesarites have described for us. After a stop off the great island of Negroponte (Euboea) and the subjection of the little island of Andros, the crusaders reached Constantinople on 23 June, 1203, and disembarked the next day at Chalcedon. Constantinople made a profound impression on them,

"for they [had] never thought there could be in all the world so rich a city, and they marked the high walls and strong towers . . . the rich palaces and mighty churches . . . and the height and the length of that city which above all others was sovereign. . . . No man there was of such hardihood but his flesh trembled . . . for never was so great an enterprise undertaken by any people since the creation of the world."²⁶

Venetian determination to proceed with the attack upon Constantinople despite papal prohibition under the ban of excommunication troubled the avowed Christian conscience of the enterprising sons of S. Mark. But when the recollection of past events is disturbing, sooner or later historians will reinterpret the events. Years after the Fourth Crusade, for example, the chronicler Martino da Canale, who wrote *Les Estoires de Venise* (formerly called the *Cronique des Veniciens*) between 1267 and 1275, justified and idealized the past exploits of the Venetians. Like his contemporary Brunetto Latini, he wrote in French because he wanted his work to reach a wide public and, as he states in his preface, he wanted readers to know "how the noble city [of Venice] was founded and how it has an abundance of all good things, and how the lord of the Venetians, the noble doge [*dus*], is all-powerful and [how great] is the nobility in the city and the prowess of the Venetian people."²⁷

²⁴ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. VI, no. 101 (PL 215, 106–7); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 1948 (vol. I, p. 170): "Nullus itaque vestrum sibi temere blandiatur quod terram Graecorum occupare sibi liceat vel praedari tanquam minus sit apostolicae sedi subjecta et quod [Alexius III] imperator Constantinopolitanus, depositio fratre suo et etiam excaecato, imperium usurpavit. . . . Sed cessantibus . . . occasionibus frivolis et necessitatibus simulatis in Terrae Sanctae transeatis subsidium et Crucis injuriam vindicetis, accepturi de hostium spoliis quae vos, si moram feceritis in partibus Romaniae, oporteret forsitan a fratribus extorquere. . . . Vobis sub excommunicationis interminatione vetuimus ne terras Christianorum invadere vel laedere temptaretis. . . ." (Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. civ, pp. 416, 417). The young Alexius was continually with the crusaders from their sojourn on Corfu (cf. *Annales Colonienses maximi*, ad ann. 1203, in *MGH*, SS., XVII [1861], p. 812, ll. 18–19: "Alexius . . . venit ad nos apud Corfaut. . . ." [letter of Hugh of S. Pol], and *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII [1874], p. 118, ll. 27–28). The author of the *Devastatio Constantinopolitana*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), p. 88, says: "Dominica secunda post pascha naves a ladra ceperunt exire, et ex eodem tempore venit Alexis imperator de Alemannia."

²⁵ Inn. III, an. VI, ep. 102 (PL 215, 108BC); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I doc. cv, pp. 417–19; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 1947 (vol. I, p. 170).

²⁶ Villehardouin, *Conquête*, par. 128, ed. Faral, I, 130 (trans. Marzials). Odo of Deuil, Benjamin of Tudela, Robert of Clari, and the Chronicler of Novgorod also testify to the grandeur of Constantinople.

²⁷ Filippo Luigi Polidori, ed., *La Cronique des Veniciens de Maistre Martin da Canal*, in the *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (Florence, 1845), 270. Canale wrote in French rather than in Latin, "por ce que langue française cort parmi le monde, et est la plus delitable a lire et a oir que nule autre" (*op. cit.*, p. 268). Nevertheless, his history remained almost unknown, and has survived in a single manuscript in the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence. See in general Gina Fasoli, "La Cronique des Veniciens di Martino da Canale," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., II (Spoleto, 1961), 42–74, and Agostino Pertusi, "Maistre Martino da Canal, interprete cortese delle crociate e dell' ambiente veneziano del secolo XIII," in *Venezia dalla prima crociata alla conquista di Costantinopoli del 1204*, Florence, 1966, pp. 103–35. It is not certain that Canale was a Venetian.

For the traditions which finally made the Venetian chronicle a literary genre in itself, together with a discussion of the relationship of the numerous manuscripts of Venetian chroniclers, compilers, continuators, contaminators, and copyists, see the learned study of Antonio Carile, *La Cronachistica veneziana (secoli XIII–XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*, Florence, 1969 (Civiltà Veneziana, Studi, no. 25), who re-edits and deals especially, as his title indicates, with those portions of the chronicles which relate to the Fourth Crusade and the partition of Byzantine

In his extraordinary account of the launching of the crusade, Canale relates how the young Alexius IV, a mere boy (*un enfant de petit aage*), was brought before Pope Innocent III (*monseignor l'apostoile*), to whom an appeal was made to restore him to the throne of Constantinople. The pope welcomed Alexius and said that, since the crusading host of Franks and Venetians was then assembled at Zara, "I shall send them a message that they are to abandon the route to Jerusalem and take that to Constantinople and place this boy in possession of his city." Innocent then sent his legate [Peter Capuano] to Enrico Dandolo and the Frankish baronage at Zara with a letter, directing them "que por lor debonairete conducent li petit enfant en Costantinople, et tant facent que li Gres le tiegnent por seignor. . . ." Dandolo asked the barons and noble Venetians what was to be done, and they replied that they would follow his counsel. " 'My lords,' said the doge, 'we cannot refuse the command of the pope as our spiritual father: rather all men should obey him in everything. I pray you that all be done as he commands us.' " They all agreed and sent for Alexius, "and when he had come, my lord the doge received him in his arms."²⁸ The more the Venetians were charged with ambition, the more they sought a reputation for piety and filial devotion to the Holy See. Canale rewrote history to help them.²⁹

The account Canale gives of how the Fourth Crusade got under way became pretty much the popular Venetian interpretation of Innocent III's relations with Dandolo. Actually Canale was very little read, but a falsification of the facts much like his own became the stock in trade of the Venetian chroniclers, and gained currency

territory among the conquerors. Venetian publicists also salved the popular conscience by producing "prophecies" of the fall of Constantinople, illustrating the divine inevitability of (and so providing additional moral justification for) the incredible events of 1204 (*op. cit.*, pp. 178–83). In comparison with the documentary sources the Venetian chronicles are of slight value for the history of the Fourth Crusade except to show the self-righteous mentality of the Venetian ruling class.

²⁸ Canale, chaps. XL–XLII, in *Arch. stor. italiano*, 1st ser., VIII, 324, 326.

²⁹ Gina Fasoli, "Nascita di un mito," in *Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe*, I (Florence, 1958), 469–70, and " . . . Martino da Canale," *Studi medievali*, II (1961), 55–56, 68 ff., who shows, however, that for various reasons Canale's history enjoyed no popularity among the Venetians. For one thing, his aggrandizement of the doge's authority was unacceptable to the ruling oligarchy in Venice. For further bibliography on Canale, see Carile, *La Cronachistica veneziana*, pp. 177–78, notes.

also in the Morea, where the descendants of the Fourth Crusaders long lived in the declining splendor of late medieval chivalry. The romantic story of the fugitive prince Alexius, despoiled of his inheritance by a cruel usurper, was an appealing theme for Moreote minstrels to declaim to lords and ladies whose forebears had nobly come to his rescue, and whose subsequent good fortune was obviously the reward of virtue. But since everyone knew that the pope was the prime defender of virtue, the fourteenth-century *Chronicles of the Morea* represent Innocent III as anxious to assist Alexius to restore his dispossessed father to the throne.

Once again, Innocent is declared to have sent his legate to Zara to explain to the crusaders, according to the French version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, "how the expedition to Constantinople would be more honorable and more profitable than that to Jerusalem, because the Greeks were Christians and yet, for some error which had got into them, they were rebellious and unwilling to receive the sacraments of the Holy Church of Rome, and that it was better to regain and convert the Greeks and return them to the obedience of Holy Church, since their lord [Alexius] promised to do so, than to go off seeking that which they did not know [nor] to what end they might well come."³⁰

We need not be concerned with details of the two successful sieges of the "God-guarded city," which now succumbed to the onslaught of an invader for the first time in its history. On 7 July, 1203, the then "Tower of Galata" was taken, and on 17 July came the Venetian assault upon the north walls, from the Golden Horn. The Greeks made an unsuccessful sortie against the crusaders' camp, from the landward walls. In despair the Emperor Alexius III fled for his life. Isaac II was released from imprisonment. On 1 August Alexius IV was crowned in Hagia Sophia, and associated with his father in the precarious possession of the imperial power.³¹ At the begin-

³⁰ *Livre de la conquête de la principauté de l'Amorée: Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, pars. 31–34, pp. 10–12, and cf. *The Chronicle of Morea: Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*, ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, verses 446–517, pp. 30 ff. On the *Chronicles of the Morea*, see below, Chapter 8.

³¹ We may note here, among numerous sources, the crusaders' own statement of the events in their letter to the pope (*Inter epp. Inn. III*, an. VI, no. 211 [PL 215, 237D–240]; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXI, pp. 430–31), and esp. Hugh of S. Pol's letter to Henry I of Louvain, duke of Brabant, in T. and Th., I, 304–11; Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1202–1203, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII (1874), 880–81.

ning of the crusade the Doge Enrico had stipulated that, "so long as we act in company, of all conquests in land or money . . . we shall have the half and you the other half,"³² and therefore when the Angeli paid the crusaders 100,000 marks (half the sum promised), the Venetians took 84,000 m., for in addition to their half share they claimed payment of the crusaders' remaining debts, which amounted to 34,000 m. These facts are well known. The Angeli asked for an extension of time to meet their remaining obligations. Alexius had also undertaken to furnish the crusaders with supplies for a year, and maintain the Venetian fleet at his own expense, also for a year. The crusaders postponed their departure, set for Michaelmas (29 September), to March, 1204.³³

In the meantime, on 25 August, 1203, Alexius IV sent the pope a statement of his filial reverence for the Holy See: "What great things the Lord has done for me in these days according to his mercy, I have thought I must above all set forth to your Holiness . . . , in whose hands rest all men's authority and the rights of all kingdoms. . . ." Innocent was well aware (the young emperor wrote) how the Fourth Crusaders, that "blessed band of pilgrims" (*peregrinorum beata societas*), had rescued his father from prison and restored the diadem of empire to the lawful rulers. Alexius now fulfilled his oath, "freely given," that he would humbly acknowledge "the Roman pontiff, the universal successor of Peter, prince of the Apostles, as the ecclesiastical head of all Christendom, and would to the best of my ability lead the Oriental Church to the same obeisance if divine mercy restored to us our due possession of the empire. . . ."³⁴ Alexius's letter was undoubtedly

written by a western cleric. Its ecclesiological parlance is entirely Roman.

An imperial progress through Thrace now brought Alexius the submission of many towns and fortresses. He returned on 11 November, 1203. The inhabitants of Constantinople had been getting along badly with the crusaders, and a marked coolness was soon discernible in Alexius's own attitude, says Villehardouin, "towards those who had done him so much good." Alexius became very dilatory in making payments to the crusaders, and finally his payments ceased, especially as the hostility between the crusaders and the Greeks continued to grow, and boded no good for the future.³⁵ The willfulness of the crusaders was a source of unending anxiety, not only to Alexius in the New Rome but also to the pope in the Old.³⁶ As for the belabored and irresponsible young emperor, the commitments which he had been happy to make in the days of his exile he viewed with dismay, as he sat in stately insecurity upon the throne, and marked the attitude of his people, among whom he must henceforth live and over whom he must henceforth try to rule. Constant squabbles between the Latins and Greeks had led some of the crusaders to set fires which on 18–19 August gutted wide areas in the central city and caused much loss of life. By the beginning of December, 1203, a state of war existed between the Frankish host and the Greeks, who in their turn tried on 1 January to burn up the crusaders' fleet.³⁷ Thereafter reconciliation was

There are rather full accounts of the sieges of Constantinople by the crusaders in Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 36–48, and esp. Chas. M. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 236–69. A convenient list of some of the more important primary and secondary works relating to the Fourth Crusade is given in Edm. Faral's edition of Villehardouin's *Conquête*, I (Paris, 1938), pp. lvi–lxvii.

The Tower of Galata, *turris fortissima, quae Galatha nuncupatur* (T. and Th., I, 306), then stood on the waterfront; it was destroyed in 1261; the present Tower of Galata (*Galata Kulesi*) was first built in 1349, and has been restored several times.

³² Villehardouin, *Conquête*, par. 23, ed. Faral, I, 24: ". . . de totes conquestes que nos ferons par mer ou par terre, la moitié en avrons et vos l'autre."

³³ Cf. Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. VI, no. 211 (PL 215, 239CD); Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXI, p. 431.

³⁴ *Inter epp. Inn. III*, an. VI, no. 210 (PL 215, 236–37). This

letter is misdated 1204 in Theod. Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III* (1944), app. I, no. 12, pp. 571–72.

³⁵ Villehardouin, 207–8 ff., ed. Faral, II (1939), pp. 6, 8 ff.; Robert de Clari, *Conquête*, 58–59, trans. Edw. N. Stone, *Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades*, Seattle, 1939, pp. 211–12; Nicetas Choniates, *Isaicius Angelus et Alexius*, 3 (Bonn, pp. 735–37 ff.); *Devastatio Constantinopolitana*, in Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), pp. 90–91. Cf. Chas. M. Brand, "A Byzantine Plan for the Fourth Crusade," *Speculum*, XLIII (1968), 462–75, who has translated, with a brief commentary, a ceremonial oration by Nicephorus Chrysoberges, conceivably written in late November, 1203, and apparently intended for delivery on the feast of the Epiphany (6 January, 1204). Although hostile to the Latins, the oration is a panegyric of Alexius IV and suggests, by its restraints and suppression of the usual rhetorical venom, something of the quandary in which Alexius found himself at the time of its composition.

³⁶ Cf. Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. VI, nos. 229–32 (PL 215, cols. 259–63); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, docs. CXII–CXV, pp. 431–38.

³⁷ Villehardouin, 217–20, ed. Faral, II, 16, 18; Robert de Clari, par. LX, ed. Lauer (1924), p. 60; Nicetas Choniates, *Isaicius Angelus*, 5 (Bonn, pp. 741–42). The Fourth Crusaders inflicted such injury upon Constantinople that the city never

impossible, and the Greeks, according to Villehardouin, immediately perceived the fact, *qu'il n'i avoit mais point de la pais*.³⁸ Alexius was now in a very unenviable position, held up to opprobrium both by the Franks and by the Greeks, but on 28–29 January, 1204, his troubles were brought to an end, a violent end, for an uprising took place against him, led by Alexius [V] Ducas, called Murzuphlus (Μούρτζουφλος), because his eyebrows ran together. Alexius V was promptly crowned in Hagia Sophia. Old Isaac II died of the shock, and after the failure of two attempts to poison him, Alexius IV was strangled in prison (on 8 February, 1204).³⁹

Murzuphlus prepared to defend the capital against the barbarians from the West. Before proceeding with the second siege of the city, however, the Venetians and the crusaders signed in March, 1204, a partition treaty, dividing in advance of their conquest the city of Constantinople and the empire of which it was the capital. When the city fell, the Venetians were first to be repaid from the booty the debts due them from Alexius IV, after which there was to be an even division of the remainder between them and the other crusaders.⁴⁰ A college of six Venetians and six Franks was to elect a Latin emperor, who was to receive a quarter of the lands to be conquered, together with the palaces of Blachernae and Boukoleon. The other three-quarters of the *acquisitum imperium* were to be divided between the Venetians and the crusaders. A commission of a dozen crusaders, *XII. des plus sages de l'ost des pelerins*, and a dozen Venetians "would apportion the fiefs and honors among the men, and would devise what service

they should do therefor to the emperor."⁴¹ The Venetians secured by the articles agreed upon with the crusaders in March, 1204, all the trading and other privileges which they had been accustomed to enjoy in times past, and stipulated that, if the crusaders provided the emperor, the patriarch should be a Venetian and should possess "Santa Sophia."⁴² On 9 April the crusaders began operations and made an attack upon Constantinople. On 12 April they scaled the northern wall; Alexius Murzuphlus fled, and another fire broke out in the city. Thereafter the Latin soldiery subjected the great city of Constantine to a three-days sack (13–15 April), which evoked the wonder of Villehardouin, the disgust of Innocent III, and the utter despair of Nicetas Choniates.⁴³

³⁸ Villehardouin, 234, ed. Faral, II, pp. 34, 36; Robt. de Clari, LXVIII, ed. Lauer, pp. 68–69, and see the following note.

³⁹ For the details, see the *Pacta inter Henricum Dandulum et Crucesignatos inita*, in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I (1856), docs. CXIX and CXX, pp. 446–48, 450–51 (with which Villehardouin's account is in pretty close agreement); the pact between the crusaders and the Venetians is also reprinted in Migne, *PL* 215, 517–19. It is specifically stated in the *pacta* that fiefs may be inherited by women as well as by men. No citizen of a nation at war with Venice (i.e. a Pisan) is to be admitted into the empire for the duration of hostilities. This restriction soon applied to the Genoese also. Cf. J. K. Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, Oxford, 1915, pp. 21–22, 39 ff. The position of the emperor was left too weak for the construction or maintenance of a strong state. Fotheringham, *op. cit.*, p. 21, remarks of the treaty of March, 1204, that "the Venetian privileges are no longer dependent on the will of the emperor, but are part of the constitution of the empire." On the war between Venice and Pisa, cf. W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I (Leipzig, 1885; repr. Amsterdam, 1967), 289, and see in general the recent monograph of Silvano Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1966, pp. 14 ff.

⁴⁰ Villehardouin, 237–251, ed. Faral, II, 38–55; Robt. de Clari, pars. LXIX–LXXX, ed. Lauer, pp. 69–80; Nicetas Chon., *Al. Ducas Murzuphlus*, 2–4 (Bonn, pp. 751–63); cf. Count Paul Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols., Geneva, 1877–78, and [F. de Mély,] vol. 3 (Paris, 1903), dealing with the western traffic in relics acquired in Constantinople. There is another eyewitness account of the sack of Constantinople in the funeral oration delivered by Nicholas Mesarites, metropolitan of Ephesus from about 1213, on his brother John, who died in 1207 (see Aug. Heisenberg, *Neue Quellen zur Gesch. des lateinischen Kaiseriums und der Kirchenunion*, I: *Der Epitaphios des Nikolaos Mesarites auf seinen Bruder Johannes*, Munich, 1923, pp. 41–48.). On Mesarites, note Glanville Downey, *Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople*, Philadelphia, 1957 (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new ser., vol. 47, pt. 6), where reference will be found to Heisenberg's various studies. On the charges of sacrilege allegedly committed by the Latins when they

recovered. There were fires on 17 July, 1203, on 18 August, 1203 (lasting for two full days), and on 12 April, 1204 (for the sources, see A. M. Schneider, "Brände in Konstantinopel," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLI [1941], 386–87). The fire of August, 1203, destroyed much of the heart of the city, from the Golden Horn to the Sea of Marmara, desolating many areas that were never rebuilt, hence the open spaces, fields, and gardens noted by the early fifteenth-century travelers.

³⁸ Vill., 221, ed. Faral, II, 20.

³⁹ Vill., 222–23, ed. Faral, II, 20, 22; Nicetas Choniates, *Isaaci et Alexius*, 4 (Bonn, pp. 742–47); cf. Robert de Clari, pars. LXI–LXII, ed. Lauer, pp. 61–62; Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1204, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII (1874), 882–83.

⁴⁰ On the later division of the booty, note Villehardouin, 254, ed. Faral, II, pp. 58–59 n.; cf. Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, docs. CXIX–CXX, pp. 446, 449–50; Ernst Gerland, *Gesch. d. Lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel: Die Kaiser Balduin I. u. Heinrich (1204–1216)*, Homburg v. d. Höhe, 1905, pp. 17 ff.

On Sunday, 9 May, 1204, young Baldwin IX of Flanders and VI of Hainaut was elected the first Latin emperor, for the Venetians feared too much the power and prowess of Boniface of Montferrat, who acquiesced peaceably in the elevation of a lesser man to a greater height.⁴⁴ Fotheringham has, however, quite rightly insisted that Venetian support of Baldwin, which won him the election, was not designed to secure the weakness of the Latin empire. "Venice had in fact no interest in the weakness of the empire." The Venetians had suffered too much from the feeble and erratic exercise of imperial authority during the preceding quarter of a century. They merely wanted the new emperor to be neither pro-Genoese nor pro-Pisan, and since Boniface's Monferratine affiliations with Genoa were suspect, he was unacceptable to the doge.⁴⁵ The latter had played his cards very well. By contriving that half the college of imperial electors should be Venetians, he could and did effect the election of the emperor of his choice, and by his apparent willingness to sacrifice the imperial office to the crusaders, he also secured a Venetian elector as patriarch.

On 16 May, 1204, Baldwin was crowned with Byzantine formality in the cathedral church of

Santa Sophia.⁴⁶ Some time after the Latin conquest of Constantinople Baldwin wrote at length and in an ecstasy of victory to the pope,⁴⁷ but his messenger, one Brother Barozzi, Venetian master of the Temple in Lombardy, was held up in Modon by Genoese corsairs, who relieved him of jewels and other rich gifts being sent to the pope and to the Templars,⁴⁸ and so the emperor's letter was long in reaching Innocent. Baldwin's position was a difficult one, caught as he was between papal desires and Venetian ambitions, which he knew would not be easy to reconcile. In the midsummer of 1204 he wrote again, briefly, to his Holiness, referring to his former letter, and now enclosing a copy of the conventions agreed to by the crusaders and the Venetians in the preceding March.⁴⁹ Baldwin was doubtless disappointed by the pope's failure to respond to his letter, and apparently requested Boniface of Montferrat, Louis of Blois, and Hugh of S. Pol to write to the pope, and that they did so we know from Innocent's own letters.⁵⁰ At this time too the Doge Enrico wrote the pope about how the Venetians had been forced to take Zara; affirmed the Venetians' innocence of offense and the justice of their cause; remonstrated against the sentence of excommunication leveled at him and his fellow citizens (which they had been bearing *patienter et humiliter*); recounted briefly the great feat of arms whereby, under divine guidance, Constantinople had been won; declared that everything the Venetians had done was for the honor of God and the Holy Roman Church; and, finally, hoped that his Holiness would take favorable action upon the petitions which the Venetian envoys would place at his feet.⁵¹

occupied Constantinople, see J. Darrouzès, "Le Mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins," *Revue des études byzantines*, XXI (1963), 81–86, 98–99.

⁴⁴ Baldwin himself described the establishment of the Latin empire in a long, rhetorical letter to Innocent III (*Epp.*, an. VII, no. 152 [PL 215, 447–54], and cf. *Gesta Inn. III*, chap. xci [PL 214, col. cxlibc]); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I (1856), doc. cxxii, pp. 501–11; Villehardouin, 256–61, ed. Faral, II, 60–68; Robt. de Clari, pars. xcvi ff., ed. Lauer, pp. 92 ff.; Nicetas Choniates, *Liber de rebus post captam urbem gestis*, 6 (Bonn, pp. 789–90); Edm. Faral, in *Rev. hist.*, CLXXVII (1936), 573–75; Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 4–7, 11–12; L. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (1926), 242–44; Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople* (1949), pp. 49–51.

On the establishment of the Nicene "empire in exile," see the important study of B. Sinogowitz, "Über das byzantinische Kaisertum nach dem Vierten Kreuzzuge (1204–1205)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLV (1952), 345–56, who shows that it was Constantine Lascaris, not his brother Theodore, who was proclaimed "emperor" in Hagia Sophia on 13 April, 1204, after the flight of Alexius V the preceding night. Constantine died in the early spring of 1205, and Theodore succeeded him as emperor. For the reasons given by Franz Dölger, *ibid.*, LII (1959), 445, it is better not to call the first Lascarid "Constantine XI" (as some recent historians have done), which would make the last Byzantine emperor at least the XIVth Constantine.

⁴⁵ Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 22–24.

⁴⁶ Villehardouin, 263, ed. Faral, II, 68, 70; Robt. de Clari, xcvi–xcvii, ed. Lauer, pp. 93–95; Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 7–9; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 51–53.

⁴⁷ *Inter epp. Inn. III*, an. VII, no. 152 (PL 215, 447–54; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. cxxii, pp. 501–11).

⁴⁸ The pope threatened the Genoese with the interdict (*Epp.*, an. VII, no. 147, in PL 215, 433, dated 4 November, 1204). Cf. Ogerio Pane, *Annales*, in L. T. Belgrano and C. Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, II (1901), p. 93, cited by Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo* (1915), pp. 39–40.

⁴⁹ *Inter epp. Inn. III*, an. VII, no. 201 (PL 215, 510D–511A; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. cxxvii, pp. 520–21).

⁵⁰ *Inn. III*, an. VII, ep. 203 (PL 215, 516A; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. cxxix, p. 527), dated 21 Jan., 1205 (Pothast, *Regesta*, no. 2382 [vol. I, p. 205], and, *idem*, an. VII, VI id. Febr., in Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. cxxxiv, p. 536, dated 8 Feb., 1205 (Pothast, no. 2407 [vol. I, p. 206]).

⁵¹ *Inter epp. Inn. III*, an. VII, no. 202 (PL 215, 511–12;

Some months later Innocent was to grant the Venetian requests (on 29 January, 1205), as we shall see, but it did not suit his purpose yet to lift the ban against the Venetians and to recognize their vast acquisitions in the Levant, and so he did not act upon their overtures. When he responded on 7 November, 1204, to Baldwin's first letter, he did not mention the treaty of the preceding March, although he gave his thanks to God that such a victory had been accorded to Latin arms and to the sacrosanct Roman Church, and he charged both the clerical and lay crusaders "to defend and hold the empire of Constantinople," through the aid of which the Holy Land could the more easily be freed from pagan hands. The Latin emperor was to meditate however upon the fact that the Greek empire had ever gone from bad to worse until its fate had been to pass from the control of the proud to that of the humble, from the inobedient to the devoted, from schismatics to Catholics, and this by the just judgment of God: there should be rendered unto Caesar that which was Caesar's, and to God that which was God's—"without confusion."⁵² In similar terms he addressed the crusading clergy on 13 November; the fall of Constantinople was the Lord's doing, "marvelous in our eyes."⁵³ Almost a month later, on 7 December, 1204, Innocent wrote again to the Catholic clergy in Constantinople, directing them to appoint Latin priests to churches whose Greek clergy had fled and to elect a *rector* or *provisor*, presumably a patriarch, to exercise authority over them, for it was not fitting that the members should subsist without the head.⁵⁴ But as Innocent probably knew by this time, after Baldwin's coronation the Venetians had promptly taken over the Church of Santa Sophia; the Venetian clergy had then chosen a cathedral staff of some fifteen canons, of whom four could not write!⁵⁵ These alleged

canons now proceeded to elect the subdeacon Tommaso Morosini, then in Italy, as the first Latin patriarch of Constantinople.⁵⁶

When Innocent could no longer disregard such action and the time approached for his own decision, he began by having the consistory declare the election of Morosini uncanonical and therefore unacceptable without papal approval. But he soon perceived no advantage in delay. His great concern for the continuance of the crusade, for the establishment of order in the new Latin empire, and for the union of the Churches led him finally to write the clergy in Constantinople, the emperor, and the doge that those clerks from Venice, "who called themselves elected canons of the Church of Santa Sophia," had never received papal authorization to elect the Latin patriarch, and their action had been denounced publicly in the consistory; nevertheless, the pope himself now elected and confirmed Morosini as the patriarch, at the behest of the emperor and in the hope that the Venetians would display a larger steadfastness in the service of the Cross (on 21 January, 1205).⁵⁷ At long last, on 29 January, 1205, Inno-

whom the pope denounced, all swore henceforth to admit only Venetians (or clerics who had served ten years in Venetian churches) to the cathedral chapter in Constantinople. The oaths of the eleven literate canons (dated 8 May, 1205) and of the four illiterates qui . . . scribere non poterunt (dated 14 May) were duly inscribed in the *Libri Albus et Pactorum* in Venice (Tafel and Thomas, I, 547, 550, and T. and Th., *Der Doge Andreas Dandolo . . . Mit den Original-Registern des Liber Albus, des Liber Blancus und der Libri Pactorum* [offprint from the *Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie d. Wissen.*], Munich, 1855, pp. 36, 67).

⁵² Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 203 (PL 215, 515BCD; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXIX, p. 527); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2382 (vol. I, p. 205); and Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXXIV, p. 536; Potthast, no. 2407 (latter doc. not in Migne); cf. *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. xcvi (PL 214, cols. CXLIIID-CXLIIIA); *Devast. Constantinopol.*, in Hopf, *Chron. græco-rom.* (1873), p. 92; Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 14-15; Leo Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Patriarchats von Konstantinopel (1204-1261) und der venezianischen Urkunde*, Weimar, 1938, pp. 25-28 (Historisch-diplomatische Forschungen, vol. 3). On the election of Morosini and the attempts of the Venetians to control the Latin patriarchate against the opposition of Innocent III, see Robert Lee Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), 227-42.

⁵³ Inn. III, an. VII, epp. 203-204 (PL 215, 512D-517AB; Tafel and Thomas, I, docs. CXXIX-CXXX, pp. 524-29); Potthast, *Regesta*, nos. 2382-83 (vol. I, p. 205): "... clerici Venetiarum, qui ecclesiae Sanctae Sophiae se canonicos electos appellant, . . . [non] jus habuerant eligendi . . . propter quod electionem ipsam, de communi fratrurn nostrorum consilio, curavimus in publico consistorio reprobare . . . eundem subdiaconum nostrum [Thomam Maurocenum] . . . elegimus et confirmavimus eidem

Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXVIII, pp. 521-23; *Gesta Innocentii*, chap. xcvi (PL 214, col. CXLIIIA).

⁵⁴ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 153 (PL 215, 454-55; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXIV, pp. 516-17); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2321 (vol. I, p. 200).

⁵⁵ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 154 (PL 215, 456-61; 456A; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXV, pp. 518-19); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2324 (vol. I, p. 200).

⁵⁶ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 164 (PL 215, 471-72; Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXVI, pp. 519-20); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2339 (vol. I, p. 201).

⁵⁷ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, docs. CXLIV-CXLV, pp. 547-51; cf. Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 203 (PL 215, 516C); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2382 (vol. I, p. 205), letter dated 21 January, 1205. The newly elected "canons" of Santa Sophia,

cent wrote two letters to the Doge Enrico Dandolo, the first reply the doge received to the letter and envoys he had sent to the pope some months before: Innocent could not confirm the treaty of March, 1204, which had provided, subject to papal consent, for the excommunication of anyone who might seek to go against its terms, at the same time as it gave the power of altering the terms to a commission of six Franks and six Venetians, who would thus be almost wielding the power of excommunication,⁵⁹ an arrangement which Innocent naturally declined to accept.⁶⁰ The treaty of March, 1204, also provided for the division of (Greek) ecclesiastical properties between the Venetians and the Franks, with the retention by the clergy of a portion sufficient to support them honorably, and this too Innocent indignantly rejected.⁶¹ There was to be no secularization of church property.

The Venetian envoys had also asked on the doge's behalf, since he bore the burden of too many years and too much work, *cum sis confectus senio et labore confractus*, that he be released from his vow to make the journey overseas, for he could aid the dispatch of an army to the Holy Land without accompanying it himself. Innocent spoke of the doge's great reputation, his keenness of mind, and maturity of judgment, and how these qualities would assist the Christian army in its noble enterprise. The emperor and the crusaders had never ceased to din into the papal ears the great service the doge had rendered to them. Innocent believed them, and he could not now dispense with the doge's help—Enrico Dandolo had served the world thus far, and had received therefor no small glory; let him now serve God, who leaves no good unre-

warded and no evil unpunished.⁶² It was a masterly response; Enrico Dandolo could not fail to read between the lines; the pope did not intend to give up the chief weapon he could use against the wily doge. The latter had written Innocent that the cardinal legate Peter Capuano had released him and the Venetian host from the ban of excommunication; Innocent accepted the fact, if it was true, and himself confirmed the decree of absolution, provided the cardinal legate would verify it.⁶³ Innocent had had too much experience of Venetian diplomacy not to proceed with caution.

On 8 February, 1205, Innocent wrote to the Emperor Baldwin, the Doge Enrico, Boniface of Montferrat, and the other leaders of the army, warning them to refrain from any division of the possessions of the Church, and threatening to meet any such action on their part with "ecclesiastical censure."⁶⁴ Already in the preceding fall, however, the crusaders and the Venetians had divided the Byzantine properties, lay and ecclesiastical alike, and they had no intention of depriving themselves of lands and goods which they looked upon as theirs by right of conquest, merely because these lands and goods had previously belonged to Byzantine clerics, and because the pope refused to see them secularized. They had been generous enough; after all, the pope had sought to impede their venture from the first; and what had the clergy conquered? Decent provision had been made for them. What right had they to more? Every right, was the papal response, and the controversy continued until a shaky settlement was reached on 17 March, 1206, and confirmed by the pope on 5 August following, whereby subject to certain detailed qualifications the Latin clergy received one-fifteenth of all the crusaders' new possessions, *quinta decima pars omnium possessionum*, located without the walls of Constantinople; freedom from lay jurisdiction; and "of the lands which, God willing, shall henceforth be con-

Ecclesiae patriarcham" (PL 215, 516CD). On 5 March, 1205, Tommaso Morosini was made a deacon, on the twenty-sixth a priest, on the twenty-seventh a bishop, and on the thirtieth he received the archiepiscopal pallium (Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, p. 16). On the personal appearance of Morosini, note Nicetas Choniates, *Urbs capta*, 12 (Bonn, p. 824), and *De signis CP.*, I (*ibid.*, pp. 854–855): So shaved as to appear beardless, fat as a pig, and dressed in skin-tight clothes, Morosini was an object of especial detestation to the Greeks (*cf.* Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 84, 95).

⁵⁹ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, docs. CXIX–CXX, pp. 448, 452; *Instrumentum concordiae*, in PL 215, 519BC.

⁶⁰ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 206 (PL 215, 520AC; T. and Th., I, doc. CXXXI, p. 530); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2398 (vol. I, p. 206).

⁶¹ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 206 (PL 215, 520B; T. and Th., I, doc. CXXXI, p. 530).

⁶² Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 206 (PL 215, 520D–521AB; T. and Th., I, doc. CXXXI, p. 531); *cf.* Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1205, no. 9, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 208.

⁶³ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 207 (PL 215, 521CD; T. and Th., I, doc. CXXXII, p. 532); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2399 (vol. I, p. 206).

⁶⁴ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 208 (PL 215, 521D–523A; T. and Th., I, doc. CXXXIII, pp. 532–34); Potthast, *Regesta*, nos. 2406, 2408 (vol. I, pp. 206, 207).

quered, the Church shall first have a fifteenth part, before they are distributed to anyone."⁶⁴

In accord with the undertakings made before the imperial election, Boniface of Montferrat, as the defeated candidate, was to be invested with Asia Minor and the Peloponnesus, "the island of Greece," together with Crete, which Alexius [IV] Angelus had promised him at the very beginning of the crusade.⁶⁵ The conquest of these was taken for granted although almost all of them were other people's possessions, a fact which moved Nicetas Choniates to especial indignation.⁶⁶ Boniface, however, proposed to the Emperor Baldwin the exchange of Asia Minor, and perhaps the Peloponnesus also, for the city of Thessalonica and Macedonia, "because this realm was beside that of the king of Hungary, whose sister [Margaret, widow of Isaac II Angelus] he had married" [in May, 1204].⁶⁷ It had also been the fief, as we shall note presently, of Boniface's brother Nerio. There was much discussion. With extreme reluctance Baldwin made the grant, for which Boniface did homage, "and there was very great joy throughout the whole army." But in the summer of 1204 during the course of Baldwin's westward campaign against Alexius III a most awkward situation arose which imperiled the future of the Latin empire. Baldwin and Boniface quarreled in the crusaders' camp outside Mosynopolis, near the bay of Lagos in western Thrace: Boniface had asked his liege lord's permission to go to Thessalonica, whose people, he said, had indicated their readiness to

receive him, and thereafter he would return, if Baldwin so wished, for a campaign against Ioannitsa (Kaloyan), *qui est rois de Blakie et de Bogrie*. Baldwin insisted, however, on making an expedition himself to Thessalonica to receive the direct submission of the inhabitants. He pushed on ahead, and spent three days before the city, where his authority was recognized on condition of his observance of the laws and customs whereby the Greek emperors had ruled the second city of their empire. Boniface was outraged and promptly occupied the stronghold of Demotica, on the Maritsa, a place that was, says Villehardouin, "very beautiful, very strong, and very rich." He then laid siege to Adrianople, which Baldwin had recently taken over. When the news of these events reached the Doge Enrico, Count Louis of Blois, and the barons in Constantinople, they were filled with apprehension lest the whole conquest they had achieved was being lost.⁶⁸

A baronial council met in the palace of Blachernae, and decided to send Villehardouin, who was willing to go, to Adrianople to reason with Boniface. When the latter learned of the arrival of Villehardouin and his fellow envoys, he rode out to meet them with Jacques d'Avesnes, Guillaume of Champlitte, Hugh of Coligny, and Othon de la Roche, who stood the highest in his councils (*qui plus halz estoient del conseil del marchis*). Villehardouin declares that he upbraided his good friend Boniface soundly for having recourse to the violent occupation of the emperor's lands before seeking justice of the barons in Constantinople, "who would certainly have secured him redress if the emperor had done him any wrong." Boniface was prevailed upon to submit his case to four arbitrators—the Doge Enrico, Louis of Blois, Conon of Béthune, and the good Villehardouin himself—and the siege of Adrianople was raised. Boniface withdrew with his forces to Demotica, "where the empress [Margaret] his wife was." When his decision was made known in Constantinople, the barons were very much gratified, and wrote to Baldwin, inviting him also to submit his case to their adjudication, for they could not tolerate such a war on any conditions.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 142 (PL 215, 967); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II [1856], doc. CLXXIII, pp. 31–34, with passage quoted from p. 34; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2867 (vol. I, p. 245); Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1206, no. 5, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 233; Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich* (1905), pp. 75–78; and Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate . . .," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), 256–58.

⁶⁵ Villehardouin, pars. 258, 264, ed. Faral, II (1939), pp. 64, 70; Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I (1856), p. 461, and doc. CXXIII, p. 513.

⁶⁶ Nic. Chon., *Urbs capta*, 6 (Bonn, pp. 787–88), but Nicetas attributes much larger territorial ambitions to the Latins than they actually entertained.

⁶⁷ Villehardouin, pars. 264–65, cf. 262, ed. Faral, II, pp. 70, 72, 68. Margaret of Hungary was called Maria by Innocent III as well as by the Greeks (Nicetas Choniates, p. 792). Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines calls her Margaret. Cf. Innocent's undated letter (in late August, 1205?) to Maria, *quondam Constantinopolitana imperatrix*, in *Epp.*, an. VIII, no. 134 (PL 215, 714); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 2574 (vol. I, p. 221); Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1205, no. 8, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 208.

⁶⁸ Villehardouin, 265, 272–82, ed. Faral, II, pp. 70, 72, 80–90; Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich*, pp. 20–25; Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (1926), 247–49; Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 58–60.

⁶⁹ Villehardouin, 283–88, ed. Faral, II, 92–96. Margaret was often called the empress because of her previous marriage to Isaac II Angelus.

On 12 August, 1204, while Boniface still held Adrianople under siege, he had made a secret agreement with the Venetians, who obviously promised to secure a judgment in his favor. He now ceded to the Venetians his claim to the important island of Crete, which the Genoese were anxious to secure, and which Alexius [IV] Angelus had promised him. In addition Boniface ceded his claim to 100,000 hyperperi also promised by Alexius as well as certain Monferratine rights to the territory of Thessalonica, which the Emperor Manuel Comnenus had granted his brother Nerio of Montferrat on some terms or other, a quarter of a century before, on the occasion of Nerio's marriage to Manuel's daughter Maria (in 1179). Boniface was to receive, in return for all this, only one thousand marks of silver and lands enough in the western part of the new Latin empire to guarantee him an annual return of 10,000 gold hyperperi—which clearly means that Thessalonica was thus retroceded to Boniface, and that the Republic of S. Mark undertook to maintain him therein.⁷⁰ It was emphasized that Boni-

face's agreement with the Venetians in no way impaired his fealty to the emperor. Verbal commitments may also have assigned to him those territories in central Greece and the north-eastern Morea which the "partition of Romania" appears to have allotted to the crusaders and the Venetians respectively,⁷¹ but which Boniface was soon seeking to take over by force of arms.⁷²

As the Emperor Baldwin returned from Thessalonica, where he had left a garrison, to Constantinople, he was approached by a delegation sent by the barons to submit his differences with Boniface to them for settlement. At first he refused to do so, on the advice of his councillors, although a few days after his return to the capital he yielded to the barons, having perceived "that he had been badly advised to become embroiled with the marquis." The barons sent five of their number, including Villehardouin, to Demotica to summon Boniface, who now returned to the capital himself with one hundred men-at-arms. The baronial parliament assembled, bespoke the original cession of Thessalonica to Boniface, and formally declared the city and its territory to

⁷⁰ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I (1856), doc. CXXIII, pp. 513, 514: ". . . de insula Crete, que michi data vel promissa sive concessa fuit per Alexium Imperatorem [probably at Corfu], filium Ysachii quondam defuncti Imperatoris . . . et de toto feudo [in or near Thessalonica] quod et Manuel quondam defunctus Imperator dedit patri [fratri?] meo . . . me foris facio cum omni iurisdictione et in vestra plenissima potestate relinquo. . . . Vos ad presens michi dare debetis mille marchas argenti et tantas possessiones a parte occidentis [i.e. Imperii Constantinopolitani, thus returning to Boniface the city and territory of Thessalonica, which he had just given up to the Venetians, on which cf. Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 25–27] quarum redditus sint decem milium yperperorum aureorum . . . annuatim. . . ." Cf. Usseglio, *op. cit.*, II, 249. There are two classic passages in the chroniclers cited in illustration of Boniface's brother's fief at Thessalonica: Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont S. Michel (de Monte), writing immediately after the event (he died in 1186), declares that "Manuel Imperator Constantinopolitanus dedit Rainerio, filio Willermi principis Montis Ferrati, filiam suam. . . . Que cum diceret, se numquam alicui nupturam, nisi esset rex[!]. . . . [Imperator] fecit coronari Rainerium . . . et dedit ei honorem [= feudum] Thesolonicensium, qui est maxima potestas regni sui post civitatem Constantinopolitanam" (*Cronica*, ad ann. 1180 [1179], in *MGH, SS.*, VI [1844], p. 528, 11. 17–22, and in the *Rolls Series*, IV [1889], pp. 28 f., ad ann. 1180). Bishop Sicard of Cremona, in his *Cronica* written ca. 1210–1212, says that "Rainerium adolescentem decorum aspectu Constantinopolim misit [i.e. his father, Wilielmus marchio], qui promissam [i.e. by the Emperor Manuel] imperialem filiam pariter cum Salonicensi corona suscepit" (*MGH, SS.*, XXXI [1903], p. 173). Cf. Usseglio, *op. cit.*, I, 156–57.

Although Nerio of Montferrat was never "king of Thessalonica," he was made a caesar by Manuel (cf. Nicetas Choniates, *Alexius, Manuelis Comneni Filius*, 4, in ed. Bonn,

p. 300, and Wm. of Tyre, *Hist. transmarina*, XXII, 4, in *PL* 201, 850), and he obviously acquired at this time some property or perhaps a regular Byzantine "fief" (*pronoia*), to which Boniface is alluding in the document of 12 August, 1204, in which *patri* seems to be a scribal error for *fratri*, easy enough in a document written at dictation. Cf., however, Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo* (1915), 26–35, and Antonio Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romanie," *Studi veneziani* [of the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice], VII (Florence, 1965–66), 139, note 81; 152–53; 156 ff. On 12 August, Boniface received the immediate payment of the 1,000 marks of silver, for which he gave Marco Sanudo and Ravano dalle Carceri a receipt (published by V. Cervellini, with a commentary, in the *Nuovo Archivio veneto*, new series, XVI [1908], 262–78, text on pp. 274–75, ref. from Fotheringham): the negotiations were obviously conducted with the greatest speed and apparently with the greatest secrecy. By the pact of 12 August, 1204, Crete became a direct dependency of Venice, and the podestà in Constantinople had no authority over the island (Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane* [1966], p. 21).

⁷¹ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, doc. CXXI, pp. 487–88, 493 (central Greece to crusaders), and pp. 468–69, 490 (Morea to Venetians). Boniface's share of the partition is not described in the treaty (cf. T. and Th., I, 460): excepting a few important places such as Demotica and Traianopolis, just west of the river Maritsa, the great stretch of territory going west to the Vardar (Axius) is not apportioned in the treaty, thus providing *ex silentio* for Boniface's lordship of Thessalonica. Everyone knew what Boniface's share was to be (cf. Gunther of Pairis, in Paul Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I [1877], 109, and Jean Longnon, *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 78 ff.).

⁷² Cf. Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, p. 31.

be his. Villehardouin was to hold Demotica as a guarantee of imperial good faith, and return it to Baldwin when Boniface had been duly established in his newly won realm. Baldwin yielded to the pressure thus brought to bear upon him, and became reconciled with Boniface, to the enormous relief of the army of the crusaders.⁷³ Peace was re-established, justice done, self-destruction averted. The Latin barons had reason to be satisfied, and there were those in the host who regarded the taking of Constantinople as an act of vengeance and retribution falling upon the Greeks for their treacherous seizure of Troy. So we are informed by Gunther of Pairis and by Robert of Clari, for the Franks were of course descended from the ancient Trojans, as Vergil makes almost abundantly clear in the Aeneid.⁷⁴

Some time during the summer or the early autumn of 1204 a commission finally drafted the *Partitio Romanie* (or *Regni Graeci*), which followed, on the whole, but now made more specific, the general agreements of the preceding March, in which later events had made some changes necessary, especially to allow Boniface to construct his lordship of Thessalonica in western Thrace and eastern Macedonia, between the Hebrus (Maritsa) and the Axios (Vardar) rivers.⁷⁵ The emperor's share was now made to include the lands surrounding the Sea of Marmara, the "Bracchium S. Georgii," although the Venetians received its western shore, south of Heraclea, together with a strip of territory reaching inland to Adrianople. In Europe the emperor received the lands lying east of a line drawn on the map from Tzurulum (Chorlu) in southeastern Thrace to Agathopolis, north thereof, on the Black Sea, a small territory but a rich one. In Asia Minor he received the lands lying north of a line drawn from Adramyttium, near the island of Lesbos, to the mouth of the river Sangarius, a boundary which proved difficult to maintain despite the Latin alliance soon

to be made with David Comnenus of Pontic Heraclea (Ereghli) and Trebizond,⁷⁶ for it lay along the borders of the newly founded empire of Nicaea, which increased in strength as the years passed. Finally, among certain other possessions the emperor also received some of the larger islands of the eastern Aegean, especially Samothrace, Lesbos, Chios, Lemnos, Samos, and Cos. The emperor was to possess, however, only five eighths of Constantinople, the remainder of the city including Santa Sophia falling to the Venetians.⁷⁷ The Lion of S. Mark got his full share. The Venetians took over or claimed certain places well located for the naval defense of their far-flung commerce, although this aspect of the terms of the partition has probably been given undue emphasis. The Venetians were assigned the European lands to the west of those of the emperor, from Heraclea and the Thracian Chersonese (including Gallipoli) to the upper reaches of the Maritsa, extending north of and including Adrianople, *cum omnibus que sub ipsa*. In the Aegean they received Oreos and Carystus on the island of Euboea (Negroponte), Aegina, Salamis, and Andros, but not the island of Naxos, later the central fief of the duchy of the Archipelago. Crete had of course been made over to them by Boniface of Montferrat. Finally the Venetians were also given the western Peloponnesus (the Morea) as well as Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, and the Ionian islands.⁷⁸ The

⁷³ Cf. Nicetas, *Urbs capta*, 13 (Bonn, p. 828), and 16 (pp. 842, 844–48), and Wm. Miller, *Trebizond: The Last Greek Empire*, London, 1926, pp. 17–18.

⁷⁴ For the emperor's share of the *Partitio regni Graeci*, see Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXI, pp. 473–79, 491–92, and cf. K. v. Spruner and Th. Menke, *Hand-Atlas f. die Gesch. d. Mittelalters u. d. neueren Zeit*, 3rd ed., Gotha, 1880, map no. 86 and p. 40. Cf. the agreement of October, 1205, between the Venetian podestà in Romania, Marino Zeno, and the then regent of the empire, Henry (Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CLX, pp. 571–73), making further provisions for the regularization of Venetian-Imperial relations (Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 69–71). The emperor seems to have acquired the crusaders' portion of the capital, for a document of 7 April, 1231, shows that he possessed five-eighths of the city, *civitatis Constantinopolitane quinque partibus de octo partibus pro sua parte remanentibus Imperatori* (T. and Th., II [1856], doc. CCLXXVII, p. 283). On the organization of the Venetian colony in Constantinople, cf. W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, I, 285–89, 296, and the works of Brown, Thiriet, and Borsari cited above.

⁷⁵ Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXI, pp. 464–73, 489–91. The assignment to Venice of "Oreos [et] Caristos" has been erroneously assumed to constitute a grant of all Euboea although in time the Republic did extend its influence over the entire island (cf. Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 82, 154).

⁷³ Villehardouin, 289–99, ed. Faral, II, pp. 96–106.

⁷⁴ Gunther of Pairis (in Alsace), *Hist. Constantinopolitana*, XVIII, XIX, ed. Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I (1877), 104, 107–8; Robt. de Clari, *Conquête*, CVI, ed. Lauer (1924), pp. 101–2; and cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 54–55.

⁷⁵ Cf. Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 29–30; Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, I (1885, repr. 1967), 269 ff.; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 49–50, 60, 61–62; Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romanie," *Studi veneziani*, VII (1965–66), 157 ff., who takes issue with his predecessors in various details. Every particularity of the final plans for partition of the empire will probably never receive full clarification.

doge became a Greek "despot;" he did no homage and paid no feudal rents to the Latin emperor; he was "lord of a fourth and a half of

For a full discussion of the partition treaty and a new edition of the text, consult Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae," *Studi veneziani*, VII (1965-66), 125-305, and see also J. K. Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo* (1915), pp. 36-38, as well as Spruner-Menke, *Hand-Atlas*, 3rd ed. (1880), map no. 86.

The Venetians also acquired some dominance over the Aegean islands by a number of contemporaneous but probably unco-ordinated expeditions, the earliest of which took place after the summer of 1206. Cf. Andrea Dandolo, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1206-1207, in the new Muratori, *RİSS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 282: "... plerique nobiles, ceteris sibi conligatis [i.e. other Latin nobles, especially Venetians], Grece opida audacter invadere statuunt et segregatim navigantes Marcus Sanuto cum suis sequacibus insulas Nixie, Parii, Melli et Sancte Herini adeptus est, et Marinus Dandolo Andram." When Dandolo says that the Venetian nobles sailed separately, he means it.

The most important of these expeditions gained the adventurous Marco I Sanudo the famous duchy of Naxos about 1207, and after him his heirs bore the ducal scepter of the Archipelago (i.e. *Egeo pelago*) for more than a century and a half. They were succeeded, violently, by the Crispi in 1383. Twenty-one dukes of the two dynasties ruled as vassals, first of the Latin emperors, next of the Villehardouin princes of Achaea, and thereafter of the Angevins of Naples and Taranto. But they kept a kind of independence until they became tributaries of the Sublime Porte. The last Christian duke, Jacopo IV Crispo, was deposed in 1566 by Sultan Selim II, who appointed a Portuguese Jew, Joseph Nasi, the last duke of the Archipelago. See in general Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 570-649, with numerous errors; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo* (1915), pp. 41-51, 56-79; and esp. R. J. Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo, seigneur d'Andros . . .," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXV (1959), 165-68 and ff. With the exception of Marino Dandolo, the first Latin lord of Andros, the conquerors of the Archipelago seem not to have rendered homage to the duke of Naxos: neither Geremia Ghisi, lord of Skiathos, Skopelos, and Skyros, nor Andrea Ghisi, lord of Tenos and Mykonos, ever regarded himself as a vassal of Marco Sanudo (actually they began as vassals of the Latin emperor). The Ghisi held Tenos and Mykonos until 1390 when Venice took over the islands (David Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, Paris, 1971, pp. 237 ff.). None of the island dynastic families has received a fuller genealogical treatment than the Ghisi, for which historians of the Aegean owe a signal debt to R. J. Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel, 1207-1390," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), 121-72, 322-35. Loenertz has now provided a detailed exposition of the history and genealogy of the Ghisi family in *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel (1207-1390)*, Florence, 1975. And he has lately shown that occupation of the island of Astypalaea ("Stampalia") by the Querini dates neither from 1207 nor from 1310, as commonly stated, but only from about 1413, and that the genealogical table of the Querini, as given by Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), p. 489, is quite incomplete and inaccurate. See Loenertz, "Les Querini, comtes d'Astypalée, 1413-1537," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXX (1964),

the whole empire of Romania."⁷⁹ Although the Republic held directly certain strategic ports and centers, such as Durazzo on the Adriatic, Modon and Coron in the southern Morea, and Oreos and Carystus on the island of Negroponte, various aristocratic Venetian families were allowed and encouraged to found lordships for themselves both on the mainland and in the islands. The crusaders received, in the final partition treaty, the tip of the Thracian Chersonese and the lands that lay west of Venetian territory, including thus the valley of the lower Maritsa, with such towns as Traianopolis and Kipsali, Aprus and Demotica, together with some territory, in which the towns of Brissi and Gehenna were located, between the northern sectors of the imperial and Venetian holdings. They also received the eastern half of continental Greece, into which the lordship of Thessalonica extended, and in the southernmost part of which lay the "district of Athens with the dependency of Megara" (*orium Athenarum cum pertinentia Megaron*).⁸⁰

385-97, and "Les Querini, comtes d'Astypalée et seigneurs d'Amorgos, 1413-1446-1537," *ibid.*, XXXII (1966), 372-93. In July and August, 1446, the Querini purchased the island of Amorgos.

As assignments of territory were being made after the Fourth Crusade, Genoese pirates held strongholds in Corfu and Crete, as well as in the town of Modon, long a pirate resort: Venice was thus under the necessity of taking these places by force from her most determined enemy. After a struggle of almost four years (1207-1211), she succeeded in wresting Crete from Enrico Pescatore, the Genoese count of Malta (Fotheringham, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-87). For a brief sketch of the island dynasts, cf. K. M. Setton, "The Latins in Greece and the Aegean . . .," *Cambridge Medieval History*, IV-1 (1966), 425 ff.

⁷⁹ Dandolo, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1204, in *RİSS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 279-80: "Quarte partis et dimidie tocus imperii Romaniae dominator." (In this title note that *dimidie* [*dimidicie*] is an adjective: the doge became "lord of a fourth and a half" [i.e. half of a fourth], which means that the Venetians controlled three-eighths of the former Byzantine empire.) The doges used the title until 1346 (Kretschmayr, *Gesch. v. Venedig*, I [1905], 489). Cf. Tafel and Thomas, II, pp. 4, 18, 47, 55, 90, *et alibi*. On the title of despot, see Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 8 (Bonn, p. 15, and ed. Aug. Heisenberg, *Georgii Acropolitae opera*, I, [Leipzig, 1903], p. 13); cf. Sam. Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, II (Venice, 1854), 184-85, and esp. R. Cessi, "L'Eredità di Enrico Dandolo," *Archivio veneto*, 4th ser., LXVII (1960), 11 ff., on the personal aspects of Dandolo's constitutional position in the new empire and that of his ducal successors.

⁸⁰ Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. CXXI, pp. 480-88, 492-93 (esp. pp. 488, 493): καὶ τὸ ὅριον Ἀθηνῶν σὺν τῇ Μεγάρων ἐπισκέψει. Thebes and Boeotia are not mentioned in this document. Cf. Spruner-Menke, *Hand-Atlas*, map no. 86; Ferdinand Gregorovius, *Gesch. d. Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* . . . , trans. and ed. by Sp. P. Lampros, 2 vols.,

On 1 October, 1204, the Emperor Baldwin is said to have knighted more than six hundred men, to whom he gave lands, offices, or fiefs, if they required them, so that they might live in a manner befitting their new status, and he ordered the new knights to rule "with the just laws, privileges, and customs of the Athenians and the Greeks, as once, when Greece flourished, everyone ruled his dominion without any tyranny and governed justly and gloriously."⁸¹ The chronicler Gunther also declares that after the Latin capture of Constantinople "the laws and rights and other institutions which had been deemed laudable from of old, both in the city and in the province, were allowed to stand just as they had been previously, but those which appeared wrong [*reprobabiles*], were either altered for the better or changed completely."⁸² Baldwin sought to push forward with expedition the multiple tasks which faced the conquerors in the organization of their new empire. At the beginning of 1205 he wrote to Pope Innocent, requesting the latter to send him religious of the chief orders, Cistercians, Cluniacs, canons regular, and others, together with missals, breviaries, and other books which contained the ecclesiastical office according to the institutes of the Holy Roman Church, in order to establish the true faith in the new imperial domain. On 25 May the pope urged the hierarchy in France to send the Latin emperor the religious he thus requested, "men of each order, praiseworthy in character and in learning, and fervent in religion."⁸³ At the same time the emperor had requested the pope to try to prevail upon masters and students of the University of Paris "to go to Greece, there to reform the study of literature" (*quatenus, in*

Graeciam accedentes, ibi studeretis litterarum studium reformare). Innocent wrote to the masters and students of the university that "it would be no source of hardship for many of you to go to a land abounding in silver and gold and gems, well supplied with grain, wine, and oil, and rich in great quantities of all good things."⁸⁴ He assured them that their spiritual rewards would even surpass their temporal gains—if they would but serve in Greece "to the honor and glory of Him, from Whom is the gift of all knowledge"—but even so the masters and scholars of the University of Paris still preferred the Seine to the Bosphorus and the Ilissus.

After an imperial reign of some eleven months, Baldwin was captured on 14 April, 1205, by Ioannitsa, king of the Vlachs and the Bulgars, whom the Latins had converted from a possible ally into a terrible enemy by their lack of diplomacy in dealing with him. Baldwin was seized in an encounter before Adrianople in a campaign badly managed by the Latins. His defeat threatened disaster at the very beginning of the establishment of the Latin empire. Following the capture of Baldwin, who was apparently tortured and killed some time later by Ioannitsa in his capital city of Tirnovo, a year of uncertainty elapsed in the troubled affairs of the Latin empire, for the crusaders were in the gravest doubt as to his fate. At length, however, his brother Henry was able to succeed him, and on Sunday, 20 August, 1206, was crowned the second Latin emperor of Constantinople. Some twenty years later, in Holy Week of 1225, a hermit in the little Flemish town of Mortaigne, near Valenciennes, was prevailed upon by persons hostile to Countess Jeanne of Flanders to call himself the Emperor Baldwin, thus provoking what was almost a civil war in Flanders and causing a serious social upheaval.⁸⁵

Athens, 1904, I, 378; Gerland, *Latin. Kaiserreich*, p. 30. The Latin term *orium* is the Greek τὸ ὄριον, a territorial division for tax assessments (cf. Michael Choniates, *Memorial [Ἰστορικόν]* to the Emperor Alexius [III] [Angelus] Comnenus, ed. Georg Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen*, Rome, 1934, p. 283, and note on p. 289, and cf. Tafel and Thomas, I, doc. LXXXV, pp. 264–65, the grant of trading privileges made in 1199 by Alexius III Angelus to the Venetian Doge Enrico Dandolo: "Orion Patron et Methonis. Orion Corinthii, Argus et Nauplii. Orion Thebarum . . . Orion Athenarum . . ."). On the administrative terms *episkepsis* (in Latin *pertinentia*) and *orion*, note Carile, in *Studi veneziani*, VII, 228, 229.

⁸¹ *Corpus chronicorum Flandriae*, in Tafel and Thomas, I, p. 302, and cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 63, 64.

⁸² Gunther of Paris, *Hist. CP.*, XX, in Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I (1877), 109; Tafel and Thomas, I, p. 457.

⁸³ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. VIII, no. 70 (PL 215, 636–37); Pott-hast, *Regesta*, no. 2512 (vol. I, p. 215).

⁸⁴ Inn. III, an. VII, ep. 71 (PL 215, 637–38); Pott-hast, no. 2513 (vol. I, p. 215), doc. apparently dated 25 May, 1205; cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1205, no. 11, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 209.

⁸⁵ *Ep. Imp. Henrici fratri suo Gaudefrido missa*, written in September, 1206, in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, doc. CLXVI, pp. 37–42. Nicetas Choniates also bears witness to the torture and death of the Emperor Baldwin (*Urbs capta*, 10, 16, in ed. Bonn, pp. 814, 847–48); Villehardouin, 439, 441, ed. Faral, II (1939), 252, 254; Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 15 (Bonn, p. 24, and ed. Heisenberg, I, 22); Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1205, in MGH, SS., XXIII, 885, and ad ann. 1225, *ibid.*, pp. 915–16; and Dandolo, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1205, in *RiSS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 280–81. Ioannitsa himself wrote Innocent III that Baldwin "had paid the debt of the flesh while he was

When Boniface finally gained the important city of Thessalonica in early September, 1204, he quickly set about the organization of his new state, which was to become a "kingdom" five years later.⁸⁶ The aids and incidents of feudal tenure had to be arranged with the Lombards and French, Flemings and Germans, who followed him and were to fight on his behalf; they would receive, as fiefs, cities and towns and lands sacred to the gods and heroes of a long-forgotten past. In Thessalonica the churches of S. Demetrius and the Holy Wisdom were bestowed upon the Latin clergy. Boniface is declared to have been severe in his exactions of money from the Greek natives of Thessalonica and in his commandeering of the best houses in the city as quarters for his men.⁸⁷ He wanted to create a strong, compact state comprising Macedonia, central Greece, and the northeastern Pelopon-

nesus. He set up a regency in his new capital under his wife Margaret of Hungary, the widow of Isaac Angelus, whom he had married but shortly before, as we have seen, to establish a connection with the dynasty of the Angeli, and to win such support among the Greeks as this association might bring him. Having completed his preparations, which seem to have been hasty but adequate, for the conquest of Greece, Boniface now turned his attention to the south, where his chief opponent was Leo Sgourus, the archon of Nauplia, who had profited from the confusion in the Peloponnesus and central Greece to build a short-lived state for himself as the Byzantine empire crumbled before the onslaught of the crusaders.⁸⁸

As the empire was falling to pieces Leo Sgourus thought that he saw the opportunity to get some of them for himself. He now sought to add certain domains in continental Greece to his holdings in the Morea. A wiser man might have regarded the national catastrophe as a personal one, and have assumed that his own destruction was also imminent, but Leo Sgourus seems to have been merely an ambitious man. He had already attacked Attica, and he waged, we are informed, no Archidamian war, in which only the vine and the olive perished. When Sgourus had his way, he left a wilderness where a city had been.⁸⁹ Early in the year 1204, having

confined in prison" (*Gesta Innocentii*, chap. CVIII, in *PL* 214, col. CXLVIII). The Emperor Henry wrote: "... dominum et fratrem nostrum Imperatorem . . . Johannicus, crucis inimicus, interfecerat, veraciter didicimus." Baldwin now disappears from the light of history to enter the shadow of legend, on which see R. L. Wolff, "Baldwin of Flanders and Hainaut, first Latin Emperor of Constantinople: His Life, Death, and Resurrection, 1172-1225," *Speculum*, XXVII (1952), 281-322; note also the doctoral dissertation of Günter Prinzing, *Die Bedeutung Bulgariens und Serbiens in den Jahren 1204-1219 im Zusammenhang mit der Entstehung und Entwicklung der byzantinischen Teilstaaten nach der Einnahme Konstantinopels infolge des 4. Kreuzzuges*, Munich, 1972, and that of Alexandra Krantonellè, *Graeco-Bulgarian Co-operation [Σύμπραξις] against the Latins in Thrace, 1204-1206* (in Greek), Athens, 1964.

⁸⁶ Božidar Ferjančić, "Beginnings of the Kingdom of Salonica (1204-1209)" [in Serbocroatian with French résumé], *Recueil de travaux de l'Institut d'Études byzantines*, VIII-2 (*Mélanges Georges Ostrogorsky*, II), Belgrade, 1964, pp. 101-16, has shown that the title king is not applied to Boniface of Montferrat in either the contemporary literary or the documentary sources. The first Latin king of Thessalonica was Boniface's son Demetrius, crowned on 6 January, 1209, by the Latin Emperor Henry, on which see below. On his seal as well as in documents Boniface uses only the title of marquis (*marchio*), as noted years ago in G. Schlumberger, F. Chalandon, and A. Blanchet, *Sigillographie de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1943, pp. 193-94, but of course later chroniclers, such as Martino da Canale, chap. LIV, in the *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (Florence, 1845), p. 338, do indeed inform us that "li marquis de Monferral fu fait roi de Saluniqu." Cf. A. Carile, *La Cronachistica veneziana* (1969), pp. 186, 189, 196, and his excerpts from the Venetian chronicles, pp. 301, 513, where, however, Boniface is rarely referred to as king or Thessalonica as a kingdom.

⁸⁷ Nicetas Choniates, *Urbs capta*, 7 (Bonn, p. 794). After his return from the unsuccessful siege of Nauplia—the siege was abandoned from fear of Ioannitsa's apparent designs upon Thessalonica—Boniface returned to mulcting the inhabitants of his capital city (*ibid.*, pp. 818-19).

⁸⁸ Villehardouin, 300-1, 309, 324, cf. 331-32, ed. Faral, II, 109 ff. Villehardouin calls Sgourus *Asgur* or *Argur*; Innocent III calls him *Argurus* (*Epp.*, an. XIV, no. 98, dated 21 August, 1211, in *PL* 216, 460D; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 4299 [vol. I, pp. 370-71]). Cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, I, 2, 3 (Bonn, p. 14), as well as the references given elsewhere to the works of Nicetas and his brother Michael Choniates.

⁸⁹ Cf. Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 77, 5 (ed. Sp. P. Lampros, II [Athens, 1880], 124-25), written to Constantine Tornikes, logothete of the dromos, apparently in 1201-1202 (cf. Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates*, pp. 251-52). On the career of Sgourus, see Nicetas Choniates, *Liber de rebus post captam urbem gestis* (refs. below to Bonn edition); *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon (1911), pars. 96-102, pp. 31-33; *Chronicle of Morea* (Greek version), ed. Schmitt (1904), also ed. P. P. Kalonaros, Athens, 1940, vv. 1459-89, 1528 ff.; *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 53, 92-101, pp. 14, 23-25; *Cronaca di Morea (versione italiana)*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes* (1873), pp. 423-24; and cf. Hopf, "Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters . . .," in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, eds., *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, vol. 85 (1867), pp. 183, 210-11 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 117, 144-45); Gregorovius, *Stadt Athen*, trans. Lampros, I, 366-70; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 31-32, 33, 35-36, 42; Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates*, pp. 179-82. On the Tornikes family,

already, according to Nicetas Choniates, "seduced Argos and stolen Corinth," Sgourus invested Athens by land and sea. He expected an easy conquest. If the episcopal garrison, such as it was, and the embattled burghers who had taken refuge on the Acropolis were not terrified into submission by his mere appearance before the city, he was confident that his siege engines would soon reduce them to helpless surrender. Sgourus reckoned, however, without an understanding of the Athenian metropolitan, whose love of the famous city was equaled by the courage with which he was prepared to defend it. Sgourus's efforts were, very properly, doomed to failure, "for the chief shepherd of the flock at Athens was Michael Choniates," writes Nicetas, "my brother, and when I say my brother, I take pride in the relationship, and I rejoice in the blood that binds me to him, however much I do in fact fall short of the strength of his character and mind."⁹⁰ Although Sgourus was not deterred from his attack upon Athens by the archbishop's eloquence, wherewith he was assailed from the high walls of the Acropolis,⁹¹ he was

including the Constantine referred to at the beginning of this note, see Jean Darrouzès, ed. and trans., *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès, Lettres et discours*, Paris, 1970 (cf. above, note 9).

⁹⁰ Nic. Chon., *Urbs capta*, 8 (Bonn, p. 800). On the metropolitans of Athens before Michael Choniates, see Vitalien Laurent, "La Liste épiscopale de la métropole d'Athènes . . .," *Mémoires Louis Petit*, Bucharest and Limoges, 1948, esp. pp. 277–91, and especially Jean Darrouzès, "Obit de deux métropolitains d'Athènes Léon Xéros et Georges Bourtzès d'après les inscriptions du Parthénon," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 190–96: Leo Xeros died on Sunday, 18 January, 1153, and his successor George Bourtzès on Monday, 16 May, 1160. The see of Athens was apparently more important than Michael Choniates' sad description of the state of the city would lead one to believe. Both Bourtzès and his successor Nicholas Hagiotheodorites seem to have been charged with missions to Rome. Darrouzès, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès, Lettres et discours*, pp. 113–26, 152–55, 204–19, has republished six letters of George Tornikès, written between 1153 and 1155, to the Metropolitan Bourtzès. Sp. P. Lampros had erroneously assumed that these letters were addressed to Choniates (1182–1204) when he published the latter's works (in 2 vols., Athens, 1879–80, repr. Groningen, 1968—see vol. II, pp. 409–29, for the six letters in question), on which note Robert Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," *Byzantion*, XXXIII (1963), 34–37.

⁹¹ The chronicler Ephraem has obviously too high a regard for Michael's powers of persuasion when he writes, *iambico carmine*, of Sgourus's withdrawal from Athens (*Imperatores*, vv. 7287–90 [Bonn, p. 295]):

[Σγουρός] προσαρράσσει δὲ καὶ ταῖς Ἀθήναις,
ἀλλ' ἀποκρουσθεὶς ἀρχιποιμένος λόγους.
τοῦ Χωνειᾶτου Μιχαὴλ τοῦ πανσόφου,
Θήβαις ἐφορμᾷ ταχέως ἐπταπύλους. . .

[Sgourus also attacks Athens, but having been driven off by

nevertheless forced to abandon his siege, after some days, when the defenders of the fortress proved resolute and unyielding, although whether from love of their good metropolitan or from fear of Sgourus none can say. But Sgourus vented his anger upon the Athenians by burning their homes in the lower city and by seizing their animals and flocks, so necessary if the economy of Athens was not to fall below the level of subsistence (καὶ δὴ τοῖς οἰκοπέδοις ἐνίησι πῦρ καὶ προνομεύει τῶν ζώων τὰ εἰς ζεύγλην καὶ δίαιταν ἐπιτήδεια).⁹² After a few days given over to such depredation, Sgourus left Athens and went on to Thebes, "city of the seven gates," which he entered with no difficulty. He proceeded thereafter through the pass of Thermopylae, and down the slopes of Mount Oeta, to meet the defeated Emperor Alexius III at Larissa. Sgourus married his daughter Eudocia, a signal honor, it seemed at the moment, for the upstart archon of Nauplia. Alexius obviously hoped to use him. But to the historian Nicetas the misfortunes of the lady's previous husbands seemed to be but a presage of things to come, for even as the nuptials were being celebrated, Boniface was preparing to march into Greece.⁹³ At the approach of Boniface, Sgourus withdrew to Thermopylae, where he apparently thought that he might bar the crusaders' entrance into southern Greece; but the historic pass brought to the mind of Sgourus no thought of great deeds that he might emulate; for the very sight of Frankish cavalry sufficed, according to Nicetas, to make him abandon Thermopylae in terror, and set him in precipitant flight southward to the impregnable refuge of Acrocorinth.⁹⁴

Nicetas Choniates tells us, frankly and indignantly, that Greek slothfulness, cowardice, and despair made easy the conqueror's advance. Thus, although Boniface commanded no large

the words of the archbishop, the wise Michael Choniates, he hurries on to Thebes of the seven gates. . . ."]

⁹² Nic. Chon., *op. cit.*, p. 803.

⁹³ Nic. Chon., *op. cit.*, pp. 804–5; cf. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 8 (Bonn, p. 15, and ed. Heisenberg, I, 13), and the several versions of the *Chronicle of the Morea* (refs. above). Nicetas says that Alexius III was allowed by Boniface, to whom he turned over the imperial insignia (then sent to the Emperor Baldwin), to settle in Halmyros, on the Gulf of Volos in Thessaly, which from the partition treaty we know was in the lands of the Empress Euphrosyne (Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I, p. 487, and n. 5), the dominant wife of Alexius III.

⁹⁴ Nic. Chon., *op. cit.*, pp. 799–800, and cf. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (1926), 252–53.

army, but one collected from everywhere and at odds with itself, Boeotia was promptly overrun (late in the year 1204), and the Thebans received Boniface joyously, "like some Theban who was returning from a distant journey!" He overran Attica next, took Athens, and put a Latin garrison on the Acropolis (*προϊὼν δὲ κρατεῖ καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, καὶ τῇ Ἀκροπόλει φρουρὰν ἐγκαθίστησι*). The Metropolitan Michael did not resist him, as he had Sgourus, for Michael believed that the time for resistance was past. The imperial city, the source of Greek strength and of hope, had itself been taken and, to use Nicetas's metaphor, the Latin spear now cast its grievous shadow over the western as well as the eastern part of what had been, but was no more, an empire.⁹⁵ To Michael Choniates, however, it was a tragedy beyond description, thus to see his beloved Athens and so much of Greece come under the sway of the hated Latins; it caused him, in the years that followed, unceasing pain, and evoked memories which he has recounted with a heavy heart. The treasures of the Parthenon cathedral, together with his precious library, had been seized by profane Latin hands. The conduct of Leo Sgourus, however, caused Michael more grief and anger than the conduct of any Latin commander.⁹⁶ In fact, despite the undeniably harsh effects of the Latin conquest, the career of Sgourus had been, in Michael's opinion, an even greater disaster to Greece. The more study that is given to the

Latin occupation of Greece, the more it becomes apparent that the Fourth Crusaders made some effort to deal reasonably with the native population; the Latins came into Greece in 1204–1205 with the intention of establishing permanent fiefs for themselves; no Greek city was emptied of its inhabitants, as Jerusalem had been in 1099; the Fourth Crusaders had no wish unduly to provoke the hatred of those over whom they were to rule and among whom they were to live.⁹⁷ The ecclesiastical regulations made by Innocent III, as well as the provisions made by the Venetians for the governance of their colonies in Greece and the islands, were not unreasonable. The epistolary lament which the Metropolitan Michael composed to console his nephew George, an Athenian, for the death of his young son, killed by Leo Sgourus about the beginning of the year 1208, contains a most instructive passage:

Alas, but we have been enriched by our misfortunes. It has not sufficed for us to be tyrannized over by those of another race and to be subjected, as it were, to the fate of slaves, but to so much suffering from the wounds we have thus received, this alleged Greek [ὁ τάχα ὁμοειδὴς οὗτος, i.e. Sgourus] has also added, for he set the fire which spread, even before the Latin expedition, over so much of Greece and the Peloponnesus, and the coals continue to burn after the expedition. In comparison with him the Latins are to be deemed just, for the wrongs which they have done are more humane than the wrongs which he has done, and men of an alien race seem more civilized to the Greeks than those of their own race, and above all fairer and better too. Here is the proof: from the cities enslaved by the Latins no one has yet sought refuge with such a Greek, for this would have been nothing but escaping the smoke to fall into the fire. As many of his men as can escape from the garrisons under his control, desert to the Latins with a glad heart as though they were returning from hell itself. And the evidence of events bears witness for them, for where are so many of the inhabitants of Argos, Hermione, and Aegina? Where are those prosperous citizens of Corinth? Are they not all gone, unseen, unheard of? But the Athenians, at least, and the Thebans [under Latin domination] and the Chalcidians and those who dwell along the coast of continental Greece remain at home and have not yet fled their hearths.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Nic. Chon., *op. cit.*, p. 805; cf. Andrea Moresini [sic], *L'Imprese et espedizioni di Terra Santa, et l'acquisto fatto dell' Imperio di Constantinopoli dalla Serenissima Repubblica di Venetia*, Venice, 1627, pp. 244–45, and Paolo Ramusio, *Della Guerra di Costantinopoli*, etc., Venice, 1604, esp. pp. 115, 121, 134–35 ff. (a curious mélange of letters and learning).

⁹⁶ Sgourus murdered the young son of Michael's nephew George (Mich. Chon., *Epp.* 88–89, in Lampros, II, 139–42, and *epp.* 100–1, on which see below). In two long letters, or rather funeral sermons, addressed to George, Michael depicts the life of Sgourus and his servitors upon Acrocorinth, which was under prolonged siege. George's eldest son, named Michael, presumably after the metropolitan, had been seized by Sgourus, apparently at his brief siege of Athens early in 1204 (*Epp.* 100–1, in Lampros, II, pp. 165, 178, 181); Sgourus kept him as a page for four years (*ibid.*, pp. 185, 186); but when the boy broke a glass goblet, Sgourus killed him in a sudden fury (refs. in Lampros, II, 611). The Metropolitan Michael's *Epistles*, nos. 88–89, 100–101, must, therefore, be dated early in the year 1208 (cf. Gregorovius, trans. Lampros, I, 368; Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates*, pp. 182, 254–55). In one of these letters of the year 1208, i.e. *ep.* 100, 29–32 (Lampros, II, 169–70), are some interesting observations on the effects of Latin domination in Greece after a mere three or four years (on which see below).

⁹⁷ Note, for example, *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 1607–50, pp. 110, 112, and cf. *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 106–7, pp. 34–35.

⁹⁸ Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 100, 29–31 (Lampros, II, 169–70). Michael goes on to observe that even the Greek Church has fared worse under Sgourus than under the Latins, for

Geoffrey of Villehardouin, nephew of the marshal of Romania and Champagne, chronicler of the Fourth Crusade, had taken the cross with his uncle at the tournament of Écry-sur-Aisne (Asfeld) in late November, 1199. He had been among the many crusaders who had gone directly to Syria, and so he had not been present at the Latin occupation of Constantinople, which Pope Innocent III now looked upon as "the Lord's doing, marvelous in our eyes." News of the Lord's doing suggested to Geoffrey the desirability of proceeding himself to Constantinople as soon as possible, to share in the rich spoils which fortune had bestowed upon the crusaders. The summer of 1204 was far advanced when Geoffrey sailed from the Syrian coast for the great city on the Bosphorus. The weather became bad, and adverse winds drove him westward. He landed at Modon in the extreme southwest of the Morea. Modon still lay in the ruins to which the Venetians had reduced it three quarters of a century before, when it had been a pirates' nest. Here Geoffrey spent the winter of 1204–1205.⁹⁹

A Greek lord of Messenia, conceivably John Cantacuzenus, brother-in-law of the Emperor Isaac II, entered into a compact with him to conquer as much of the western Morea as they could. From the Messenian promontory the allies swept north, perhaps as far as Patras. Villehardouin had learned much of the Morea and of the Moreotes by the time his Greek ally died; the latter's son discontinued the alliance, and sought to retain all the profits thereof. It was at this point that Villehardouin learned

of the appearance of Boniface of Montferrat with his army before Nauplia, where he determined to seek aid, according to the elder Villehardouin, "and rode through the land for some six days in very great peril."¹⁰⁰ Quite apart from the hostilities which young Geoffrey then faced, there were other dangers involved, as any modern traveler can attest who has traversed the Peloponnesus, especially with a Greek driver. Narrow roads cling to the mountain sides. There are places where winter rains and landslides have washed the roads away; but there are also beautiful valleys rich in history and in legend, majestic panoramas of brown and purple mountains. Such was and still is the journey through classic Arcadia, in Villehardouin's day known as the Mesarea.

Villehardouin was well received by Boniface, "and this was but right, seeing he was very honorable and valiant, and a good knight." Boniface would have retained him in his service, and given him lands, but in the camp at Nauplia Villehardouin found his good friend Guillaume of Champlitte, grandson of Count Hugh I of Champagne (although Count Hugh had once startled the feudal world by denying that he was the grandfather of Guillaume). Villehardouin explained to Champlitte that he had just come from a very rich land "called the Morea," which name had been given to Elis for two or three generations, and was soon to be given to the whole Peloponnesus. "Take as many men as you can and leave this host," he said; "and let us go, with God's help, and conquer. And that which you shall wish to give me from the conquests, I will hold of you, and I will be your liege man." So the elder Villehardouin reports his nephew's offer, which Champlitte accepted, and with the permission of Boniface of Montferrat the great adventure was begun.

It was the spring of 1205. While Boniface looked down in discouragement from the unfortified height of Palamidi upon the strong

Michael and the Orthodox archbishop of Thebes, though dispossessed, are still "among the living and those who behold the light of day," whereas Sgourus has murdered the Metropolitan Nicholas of Corinth by inviting him to dinner and thereafter throwing him from the rocky height of Nauplia (*ibid.*, 32, p. 170, and Nicetas, *Urbs capta*, 15, in ed. Bonn, pp. 841–42). "Refer no more to the citadel of Corinth," writes Michael, "but call it the Acropolis of Hell, the garrison of death, the rendezvous of the avenging spirits, hospice of the Furies" (*ibid.*, 35, p. 171). Michael was still in Athens during the summer of 1205. Thereafter he went to Thessalonica, came back as far as Euboea, and from there took refuge in exile on the island of Ceos which the Latin crusaders had not yet occupied (*cf.* Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane* [1966], p. 37).

⁹⁹ On the Latin conquest of the Morea, see in general the recent work of Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque: Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)*, Paris, 1969, pp. 54 ff., which is especially valuable on the topography and place names of the peninsula during the period of Frankish domination.

¹⁰⁰ Villehardouin, 325–26, ed. Faral, II, pp. 134, 136. According to Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 212 (repr. 2 vols., New York, 1960, I, 146), the younger Villehardouin's first partner in the Moreote conquest was John Cantacuzenus. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 72, follows Hopf in thus identifying the Greek archon *qui mult ere sire del país* (Faral, II, 134), but one must acknowledge that the identification is entirely conjectural, as noted by D. M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos . . .*, Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1968, p. 7, note 15.

fortress of Nauplia by the sea, and Jacques d'Avesnes, already the lord of Euboea, looked up from Old Corinth to the unassailable castle on Acrocorinth, Guillaume of Champlitte and Geoffrey of Villehardouin set out with 100 knights and 400 mounted men-at-arms upon the expedition that was to determine the history of the Morea for the next two centuries. From Nauplia they made their way north to Corinth, and thence along the picturesque coast of the gulf to Patras, where they took the city and the castle too. They continued down the coast to Andravida, *la meilleur et la maistre ville de la Morée*, which had in their eyes the especial merit of being unwallled. Here the local archons and the populace came out to meet them, priests carrying the cross and icons; the Greeks made obeisance to Champlitte as their new ruler, "and he received them with great kindness." The fall of Andravida, today a forlorn little town on the railway between Patras and Pyrgos, meant the easy occupation of Elis.

Wherever Champlitte met no resistance he recognized the rights of the Greeks, gentry and peasantry alike, to their lands, customs, and privileges. Farther down the coast Pundico Castro, "Mouse Castle" (*Pontikocastro*), at the base of the small cape of Katacolo, was taken and a strong garrison was left there; some remains of the castle still stand in silent watch on the hill above the little harbor town of Katacolo. The conquerors met their first serious obstacle in the seaboard fortress of Arcadia, the ancient Kyparissia, which they were not prepared to take, although they had been accompanied all the way down the coast by a small fleet bearing their provisions and siege engines. The French version of the *Chronicle of the Morea* declares the great tower of the castle of Arcadia to have been the work of giants, *l'ovre des jaïans*, while the Greek and Italian versions attribute it to the ancient Greeks, *una torre antica edificata da Greci antichi*. Arcadia had to be by-passed, and Champlitte and Villehardouin continued to Modon. Finally the Greeks were moved to concerted action. The natives of Nikli, Veligosti, and Lacedaemonia, together with some of the Slavic Melings of Taygetus and the hardy mountaineers of Maina, formed an army from four to six thousand strong in order to oppose the Frankish advance. Now came the news that the enterprising Michael Ducas (1204–1215), who had made himself ruler of Epirus, was preparing to lead the embattled Greeks and to add the

western Morea to his newly won dominions in Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia.¹⁰¹ This was the crisis.

Champlitte quickly fortified Modon as best he could and prepared to meet the Greeks, who are said to have outnumbered his forces almost ten to one. The battle which decided the future of the Morea was fought in an olive grove called Koundoura, probably in northeastern Messenia, and victory once again attended the efforts of those stalwart figures whose deeds have given an epic quality to the history of their conquest of the Morea. The battle was fought late in the summer of 1205. Michael Ducas fled from the gray-green grove of Koundoura, and returned to Arta with narrower ambitions. Coron was besieged and surrendered; Champlitte had promised its inhabitants "to maintain each in his estate." Kalamata was occupied, and now the defenders of Arcadia gave up the tower by the sea which the giants of antiquity had built. The Morea had not been entirely overrun. Most notably, the forces of Leo Sgourus still held out in Acrocorinth, Argos, and Nauplia.

¹⁰¹ On Michael Ducas, sometimes called Michael Comnenus Ducas (but not Angelus), see the valuable article of Lucien Stiernon, "Les Origines du despotat d'Épire," *Revue des études byzantines*, XVII (1959), 90–126. Michael was the natural son of the Sebastocrator John Ducas, himself the son of Constantine Angelus and Theodora Comnena (see Stiernon, "Notes de prosopographie," *ibid.*, XIX [1961], 273–83). Theodora was the youngest daughter of Alexius I Comnenus and Irene Ducaena. Michael was of the family of the Angeli, but neither he nor his father used the name. He never bore the title despot and was thus not the "founder" of the despotate of Epirus. Although later (western) chroniclers use the title despot and the term despotate in referring to events from about 1205 (cf. Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII, 886, lines 1–2), both are officially and properly employed only after the year 1230, in which connection Stiernon makes the pregnant observation "que ce n'est point le despotat d'Épire qui donna naissance à l'empire de Thessalonique, mais à l'inverse, que l'empire de Thessalonique engendra le despotat d'Épire" (*op. cit.*, p. 124). Actually the term "despotate" denoted the dignity of the office rather than any territory which a despot might chance to rule. Later on in the century the Ducae of both Epirus and Neopatra did use the name Angelus, as is clear from the documents published by Charles Perrat and Jean Longnon, eds., *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée (1289–1300)*, Paris, 1967, where we find *Comnenus Ducas Angelus* (docs. 183, 185, pp. 159, 160) and *Comnenus Angelus* (doc. 161, p. 145) as well as *Comnenus Ducas* (docs. 41, 201, pp. 53, 172). The historian George Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, III, 4 (Bonn, II, 200), also knew the family as the Angeli. On the Ducae, see Demetrios I. Polemis, *The Doukai: A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London, 1968, pp. 87 ff., and on Michael (d. 1215?), *ibid.*, pp. 91–92.

The inhabitants of Nikli, near the ancient Tegea, and Veligosti, near Megalopolis, and Lacedaemonia or La Crémonie, as the Franks were to call it, had not yet understood the significance of the Frankish victory. Monemvasia was almost impregnable, and was not to be taken until 1248. The Tzakonic and Slavic mountaineers of Parnon and Taygetus had not yet been subdued;

but the half-century which lay ahead was to repair all these deficiencies. The conquest was a fact. On 19 November, 1205, Pope Innocent III, in a letter to the new Latin patriarch of Constantinople, could refer to Guillaume of Champlitte as "princeps totius Achaiae provinciae."¹⁰² A new state was in the making, the principality of Achaea.

¹⁰² Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. VIII, no. 153, ed. Theod. Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III*, no. 86, p. 310, and *PL* 215, 728A: "... nobilis vir, Willelmus Campanensis, princeps totius Achaiae provinciae." Champlitte's "principality" thus seems to begin as an ecclesiastical circumscription, as the "province" under the metropolitan authority of Patras. The title first occurs in an ecclesiastical context, as Innocent, *loc. cit.*, directs the Patriarch Tommaso Morosini to proceed with the consecration of the newly elected Latin archbishop of Patras; the vernacular title was commonly Prince of the Morea (cf. Jean Longnon, in the *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 83–84, and *L'Empire latin*, pp. 74–75). The ecclesiastical

term "province" seems soon to have been dropped, at least generally, and Achaea quickly became a lay "principality," a change which appears to be reflected in Innocent's correspondence, as in an. IX, ep. 244 (*PL* 215, 1079A), dated 19 January, 1207 (*nobilis vir, W. Campenen., nunc princeps Achaiae*); cf. an. IX, ep. 247 (*ibid.*, col. 1080A); and an. X, ep. 56 (*ibid.*, col. 1151D): "princeps Achaiae." On the battle of Koundoura, see Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp. 62–63, and on the Frankish castles built in the southeastern Morea against the Tzakones, Melings, and Maniotes, note A. Kriesis, "On the Castles of Zarnáta and Kelefá," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVI (1963), 308–16.

2. THE APOGEE OF THE LATIN EMPIRE UNDER HENRY OF HAINAUT (1206–1216)

THE second Latin emperor of Constantinople, Henry d'Angre of Hainaut (1206–1216), was a great man. He saved the new empire, and thus aided in the establishment of enduring Latin states in Greece, the Morea, and the Aegean islands. A year after Henry's accession, however, on 4 September, 1207, in the hills outside Mosynopolis in western Thrace, the Marquis Boniface of Montferrat, lord of Thessalonica, was caught in an ambush and killed by the Bulgars.¹ It was not for nothing that the terrible Ioannitsa, to whom the head of the stalwart Boniface was now sent, had taken the title of "Roman-slayer" (Ῥωμαιοκτόνος) the preceding year.² In the death of Boniface the Latin cause in Greece sustained an irreparable loss, and Thessalonica now passed to his younger son Demetrius, who had been born in Greece. The ambitious Count Oberto of Biandrate became the small Demetrius's guardian and the regent of his Latin realm.³

¹ Geoffroy de Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, pars. 498–99, ed. Edmond Faral, 2 vols., Paris, 1938–39, II, 312, 314; ed. Natalis de Wailly (2nd ed., Paris, 1874), chap. CXVI, pp. 298, 300; Robert de Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, par. CXVI, ed. Ph. Lauer, Paris, 1924, p. 107.

² Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 13 (Bonn, p. 26, and ed. Aug. Heisenberg, I [Leipzig, 1903], 23). The Bulgarian campaign of destruction from January to April, 1206, had been especially terrible and had driven the Greeks back into alliance with the Latins (cf. Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 84–86, and Günter Prinzing, *Die Bedeutung Bulgariens und Serbiens in den Jahren 1204–1219 im Zusammenhang mit der Entstehung und Entwicklung der byzantinischen Teilstaaten* . . . , diss. Munich, 1972, pp. 56–63, with refs.).

³ Henri de Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1948, pars. 560, 562, 570–71, 573–78, 596–611 and ff. (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades, II); also ed. Wailly, in his *Conquête* of Villehardouin (1874), chaps. XII, XIV, XV–XVI, XIX–XXII and ff. (paragraph numbers as in Longnon's edition); J.A.C. Buchon, *Recherches et matériaux pour servir à une histoire de la domination française* . . . , I (Paris, 1840), 88–89. Guglielmo, Boniface's elder son, succeeded him as marquis of Montferrat. Count Oberto was apparently still a young man in 1207–1208; Biandrate is in the province of Novara, in northern Italy. A table of the counts of Biandrate and their relationship to the marquises of Montferrat is given in David Brader, *Bonifaz von Montferrat*, Berlin, 1907, Taf. V. Oberto remained only about four years in Greece (until 1211), and after his return to Italy, Berthold of Katzenellenbogen became regent of the Latin

kingdom of Thessalonica (cf. *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. Pietro Pressutti, I [Rome, 1888], no. 526, p. 92, letter dated 21 April, 1217, Berthold being still *baiulus regni Thessalonicensis*). See Leopoldo Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XII e XIII*, 2 vols., Turin, 1926, II, 262 ff.

⁴ Louis Blondel, "Amédée Pofey, de Cologny, grand connétable de Romanie," *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, VII (1939–42), 384–86, and IX (1947–50), 177–200, has sketched the little that is known concerning the career of Amédée Pofey, whose name appears as Meboffa, Buffa, Buffedus, Buffois, etc., in the sources, and who has usually been called Amadeo Buffa. Blondel explores the historical implications of an act of 1208, preserved in an imperfect copy in the Archives d'État de Genève, whereby Pofey gave his rights and properties in the village of Cologny to the Church of Geneva: Pofey is referred to as grand constable of Romanie in the act (as early as 1208) whereas at this date he has previously been regarded as constable only of the "kingdom" of Thessalonica.

⁵ Cf. Henri de Valenciennes, *Hist.*, pars. 570–90, and esp. 598, ed. Longnon (1948), pp. 60–72, 75, *et alibi*; ed. Wailly (1874), chaps. XIV–XVII, XIX, p. 364; and see the text of Élias Cairel's famous *sirventés* beginning "Pus chai la fuelha deljaric" given by V. de Bartholomaeis, "Un Sirventés historique d'Élias Cairel," in the *Annales du Midi*, XVI (1904), 468–94. Cairel abuses Guglielmo of Montferrat, wishing that the monks of Cluny would make him their head or that he might become the abbot of Cîteaux:

Pus lo cor avetz tan mendic
Que mais amatz dos buous et un araire
A Monferrat qu'alhors estr' enperaire (vv. 12–14).

If we may believe Cairel, who was in Greece when he wrote this *sirventés* (in 1208), the Lombard barons wished to make Guglielmo the emperor. The rebellious barons who supported Biandrate included Albertino da Canossa, Guido Pallavicini (marquis of Boudonitza), Ravano dalle Carceri, Rainerio da Travaglia (from Siena), Pietro Vento (from Genoa?), and Amédée Pofey, the last being the constable of Romanie (cf. Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II [1926], 262 ff., 270, 308–9).

cerned; in December, 1208, he led a large force through bitter cold to Thessalonica. Oberto wanted, as regent of the Latin lordship, all territory from Durazzo to the town of Macri, near the ancient Stagira, on the Aegean coast southwest of Adrianople. He also claimed independent suzerainty over the lordship of Athens and the lands of Achaea.⁶ But into this amalgam of the Lombard lords of northern Greece against their feudal sovereign, the Burgundian Othon de la Roche had refused to be drawn; his loyalty may have cost him Thebes, for the Cadmea was now in the possession of Albertino da Canossa, one of the chief rebels, who apparently claimed the city for himself.⁷

At the beginning of the year 1209 the Emperor Henry gained admittance to the city of Thessalonica, and entered a contest of wits and diplomacy with Oberto. Henry won the first round. When Demetrius's mother, Margaret, to protect her son's interests, declared her allegiance to the Emperor Henry, the latter crowned the boy as king of Thessalonica (on 6 January, 1209),⁸ and sometime later, after prolonged

disagreement and numerous acts of hostility, Henry had Oberto of Biandrate confined in the castle of Serres, Count Berthold of Katzenellenbogen being his jailer, and summoned a parliament of his barons to assemble, in the following May, on the field of Ravennika, near Zeitounion, the ancient (and modern) Lamia. Othon de la Roche, among sixty others, appeared at the parliament, but the Lombard rebels shut themselves up in the Cadmea, and refused to obey the imperial summons to appear at Ravennika.⁹ The parliament met on 1–2 May, 1209, and the Emperor Henry wasted no time in the firm establishment of his authority in Greece. Oberto was still in custody, but the constable Pofey, who had assisted in the settlement, was received back into the fold. On Wednesday evening, 6 May, Henry arrived at Boudonitza, the modern Mendenitsa, between the ancient Thermopylae and the plain of the Boeotian Cephissus, then the fief of Guido Pallavicini, who had also joined the Lombard rebellion. On Friday, 8 May, Henry appeared under the walls of the Cadmea.¹⁰

The chronicler Henri de Valenciennes, who continued Villehardouin's account of the Latin Conquest, has given us a dramatic account of the Emperor Henry's appearance before Thebes and his preparations to take the Cadmea by an assault upon its walls. His reception by the native Thebans was most reassuring to him, and is most interesting to us, but it was probably what he expected, for the historian George Acropolites has testified to Henry's generous treatment of his Greek subjects, for whom he had the same regard as for his own people.¹¹ When Henry

⁶ H. de Val., *Hist.*, par. 593, ed. Longnon, p. 73; ed. Wailly, chap. xviii, p. 360, where the emperor is represented as saying: "... et sour tout chou me requierent que je lor laisse quitement Estives [Thebes], Negrepoint [Chalcis, Euboea], et toute la terre qui est de Duras [Durazzo] jusques a Macre [near Stagira]." The Lombard claims are noted elsewhere as from Durazzo to Megara, including the Argolid (H. de Val., par. 584, ed. Longnon, pp. 68–69), and also from Modon to Macri (*ibid.*, par. 599, p. 76). This comprised the whole of "Greece," i.e. all the territory won or to be won by Boniface of Montferrat after his accord with the Emperor Baldwin, and so Oberto of Biandrate could advance a specious claim to its independence of imperial suzerainty; however, the partition treaty of 1204 had assigned to Venice most of the Peloponnesus, where Champlitte and the younger Villehardouin were then campaigning!

⁷ Cf. H. de Val., par. 600, ed. Longnon, p. 77; ed. Wailly, chap. xx, p. 366: "... Aubertins, qui sires ert d'Estives." The city of Thebes thus did not fall to Alberto Pallavicini, as Ferd. Gregorovius believed (*Gesch. d. Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* . . . , 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1889, I, 351), nor to Guido Pallavicini, as Sp. P. Lampros believed (Greg.-Lampros, *Athens* [in Greek], 2 vols., Athens, 1904, I, 428); cf. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 73, 74. Albertino da Canossa is mentioned in the letters of Innocent III (*Epp.*, an. XIII, nos. 144, 154, in *PL* 216, cols. 328B, 331C). According to Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 88–89, Albertino da Canossa received Thebes from Boniface of Montferrat at the Conquest, and was *sires d'Estives*, as Henri de Valenciennes implies, until 1211 when Othon and Guy de la Roche were granted the city. He may be right, but his argument seems rather tenuous.

⁸ H. de Val., pars. 602–5, ed. Longnon, pp. 77–79; ed. Wailly, chap. xx, pp. 366, 368. Demetrius, not yet four years of age, was made a knight by the emperor, "et puis

le couronna voiant toz" (*ibid.*, 605, ed. Longnon, p. 79). Margaret, Demetrius, and the kingdom of Thessalonica were taken under papal protection (Inn. III, an. XIII, epp. 33–35, 37, dated 30 March, 1210, in *PL* 216, 226–28). Cf. Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 106–8. Demetrius, not his father Boniface, was the first "king" of Thessalonica, on which see above, Chapter 1, note 86.

⁹ H. de Val., *Hist.*, pars. 667–71, ed. Longnon, pp. 107–10. "Lombart defaillirent dou parlement, que il n'i vinrent point" (*ibid.*, 670, ed. Longnon, p. 110; ed. Wailly, chap. xxxiii, p. 406). Gregorovius-Lampros, I, 429; Ernst Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich*, Homburg v.d. Höhe, 1905, p. 186. Ravennika had been bestowed upon the Templars by Boniface of Montferrat (Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. XIII, no. 137, in *PL* 216, 324); Henry took Ravennika away from the Templars, who supported the Lombard rebels.

¹⁰ H. de Val., *Hist.*, pars. 671–72, ed. Longnon, pp. 110–11; ed. Wailly, chap. xxxiv, pp. 406, 408.

¹¹ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 16 (Bonn, p. 31, and ed. Heisenberg, I, 28): "Τὸ δὲ κοινὸν πλῆθος [i.e. even the "common people"] ὡς οἰκεῖον περιείπε λαόν."

entered the lower city of Thebes, the Greek priests (*papas*) and the leading citizens (*alcontes*), and the rest of the population both men and women, gave him a tumultuous ovation. The Greeks shouted "poluchrone" (i.e. *πολλὰ χρόνια*) to the emperor; the earth shook with the sound of drums and horns. Before entering the city, however, Henry had dismounted from his horse, and allowed the Latin archbishop of Thebes and the Latin clergy to lead him into the cathedral Church of Our Lady of Thebes, where he thanked God for the honors which had come to him. Thereupon he left the church and looked to the siege of the Cadmea, which the rebellious barons within informed him they had no intention of surrendering. But when they saw the formidable extent of his preparations to take the citadel, despite an initial failure, the besieged barons became willing to discuss peace, and peace they received from Henry on very favorable terms. They could all keep their fiefs as his vassals when they had surrendered to him the keys to the Cadmea.¹² When this was done, Thebes was presumably given to Othon de la Roche (if indeed he was not already lord of Boeotia). Henry next went on to Athens, where like Basil II after the Bulgarian campaign of 1018, he ascended the Acropolis to say his prayers in the Parthenon. He remained in Athens for two days. Othon de la Roche entertained him, as best he could, with the honors that befitted imperial rank, and on the third day Henry departed for Negroponte, whither Othon went with him.¹³

¹² H. de Val., *Hist.*, pars. 672–79, ed. Longnon, pp. 111–14; ed. Wailly, chaps. xxxiv–xxxv, pp. 406, 408, 410, 412. The archbishop of Thebes who led the Emperor Henry into the Theban minster was a Latin: the Orthodox metropolitan had fled in 1204 (*cf.* Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 100, 32, ed. Sp. P. Lampros, II [Athens, 1880], 170). The Latin archbishop of Thebes was, presumably, an old acquaintance of the Emperor Henry: when on 12 August, 1206, eight days before his coronation, Henry had taken an oath before Marino Zeno, the "podestà of the Venetians in Romania," to respect the pacts made between the Franks and the Venetians in 1204–1205, he stood in the presence of the cardinal legate Benedict of S. Susanna, the Patriarch Tommaso Morosini, *et [in presencia] electi Archiepiscopi Thebani* (G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–57, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, II, doc. CLXXIV, p. 35). Oberto of Biandrate was released in late May, 1209; he was unsuccessful in some further machinations against Henry.

¹³ H. de Val., *Hist.*, par. 681, ed. Longnon, p. 115; ed. Wailly, chap. xxxvi, p. 412: "Li empereres ala a la maistre eglyse d'Athaines en orisons: chou est a une eglyse c'on dist de Nostre Dame; et Othes de la Roche,

The Emperor Henry had good reason to offer up prayers of thanksgiving. He had succeeded in restoring imperial power and prestige in Greece. He was now uncontestedly suzerain of the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica with its dependencies, the lordship of Athens and Thebes, the margraviate of Boudonitza, and the strong barony of Salona (the ancient Amphissa). Until the parliament of Ravennika there may have been some doubt as to the feudal status of the principality of Achaëa, over which Oberto of Biandrate, as we have seen, had claimed suzerainty as the regent of Thessalonica, but the events of 1209 brought clarification to the Moreote problem also. The rebellion of the Lombard lords proved most unfortunate for the future of Latin dominion in Macedonia and Thessaly. Many of them remained disaffected and during the next decade returned to Italy one by one, unwilling or unable to defend their fiefs against the eastward expansion of the Epirote rulers Michael Ducas and his brother Theodore. With the loss of most of Macedonia and Thessaly to the Epirotes before 1223, the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica had no future, and Margaret of Hungary and her young son Demetrius lived in perennial expectation of losing their sovereignty to the aggressive lords of Epirus.

Margaret of Hungary was not only the widow of Boniface of Montferrat, however, for she had previously been married to the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelus. The Greeks knew her as Maria; she was apparently popular among them, and her rule bore easily on them in Thessalonica. A letter of Demetrius Chomatianus, Greek archbishop of Ochrida (in Bulgaria), preserves the instructive record of a lawsuit, depicting the exceptional conditions in Thessalonica under Margaret's rather pro-Greek regime. The case was heard before a mixed court of laymen and ecclesiastics in 1213. Horaia, the daughter of a resident of Thessalonica, one Romanus Logaras, who had died without leaving a will, was involved in litigation with her stepmother Sachlikina over their respective shares of the deceased Logaras's property. In 1213 the court rendered a decision largely in favor of Horaia, and for twenty-two years her stepmother Sach-

qui sires en estoit, car li marchis [Boniface] li avoit donnée, l'i honnera de tout son pooir. La sejorna li empereres ii. jors, et au tierc s'en ala viers Negrepont. . . ." *Cf.* Jean Longnon, "Sur l'Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople par Henri de Valenciennes," in *Romania*, LXIX (1946), 239–41.

likina did not seek legal action to review or reverse the court's decision. In 1235, however, more than a decade after the Greek recovery of Thessalonica and during the checkered rule of Manuel Ducas, Sachlikina suddenly had the case reopened, charging that justice had gone awry during the period of Latin domination when Margaret was regent for her son Demetrius. When the Greek archbishop of the city and the governor (δούξ) refused to reverse the decision of 1213, the persistent Sachlikina secured an action in her own favor in the high court of the Basileus Manuel, chiefly on the grounds that the judgment against her had been rendered "at the time of the Latin prelacy" (ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Λατίνων ἐφημερίας). But the indignant Horaia succeeded in bringing the dispute back into the archiepiscopal court—Manuel himself annulling the recent action in Sachlikina's favor—and it was now emphasized that the decision of 1213 was in fact the verdict of a Greek court. The office of governor of Thessalonica, ἡ δουκικὴ . . . ἀρχὴ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, was then held by the late lord George Frangopoulos, member of a distinguished local family, who had heard the case with (as assessors) the bishop of Kitros, who was still living in 1235, his brother the late bishop of Berrhoea, the bishop of Ierissos, and certain other bishops (all dead in 1235), Strymbakon of Cassandrea, the bishop of Campaneia, and Philagrios of Adramereus, all of whom were Greeks. The governor and his ecclesiastical assessors had heard the case in the great Church of the Virgin in Thessalonica. They had rendered their judgments after due deliberation and in strict accord with the law. No one was wronged, and Sachlikina was subjected to no intimidation. As for the then archbishop of Thessalonica, Garinus [the Fleming Warin], against whom Sachlikina had leveled the charge that he had exacted one hundred hyperperi of her, and had frightened her into accepting the judgment against her without further ado, it was now formally stated (in 1235) that Garinus had acted, quite without violence, in accordance with the ecclesiastical custom of the Latins, i.e., he had taken from Logaras's estate not one hundred hyperperi (which heaven forbid!), but ten for himself and another two for the clerk serving him (τῷ δὲ ἐξηπηρετομένῳ αὐτῷ ἑτέρα δύο). It was important, moreover, to bear in mind that, when the case of Sachlikina *vs.* Horaia was adjudicated, both the governor of Thessalonica and his judicial assessors were

all Greeks.¹⁴ Of interest to us is the fact that in 1213 half of the eleven episcopal sees comprising the province of Thessalonica were still presided over by Greek bishops. This may reflect the queen mother Margaret's influence and provide evidence of her endeavor to enlist the support of Greeks on behalf of her son Demetrius, whom the Lombard barons had wanted to dispossess.

Champlitte and Villehardouin had founded a principality in the Peloponnesus which was destined to survive into the fifteenth century. But the peninsula had not yet been entirely subdued, and numerous important places were still in Greek or other hands. After the departure of Champlitte from the country in 1208, to claim in Burgundy an inheritance which he did not live to enjoy, Villehardouin continued the effort to organize a new France in the Morea and to uphold its division into fiefs to be held by the Latin conquerors. A commission, which included Greeks, had already been appointed to make this division, and the results of its work had been embodied in a feudal register (called, in the Greek *Chronicle of the Morea*, τὸ βιβλίον, ὅπου ἦτο ἡ μερισία ἐγράφη . . . τοῦ καθενός). Under Villehardouin the assignment of fiefs and the obligations which went with them were now reviewed, in accordance with the register, before the barons assembled in a great parliament at Andravida, in Elis, the capital of the principality.¹⁵

¹⁴ Demetrius Chomatianus, chap. CVI, in J. B. Pitra, ed., *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, VII [sic, actually vol. VI] (Paris and Rome, 1891), cols. 447–62, on which see M. Drinov, "O nekotorykh trudakh Dimitriia Khomatiana, kak istoricheskomo materialye" [On some Works of Demetrius Chomatianus as Historical Material], in *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, II (1895), 15–23, and cf. R. L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261," *Traditio*, VI (1948), 39. On Chomatianus, note Matthias Wellenhofer, *Johannes Apokaukos, Metropolit von Naupaktos in Aetolien (c. 1155–1233)* [diss. Munich, 1912], Freising, 1913, pp. 35–38, and especially the article by Lucien Stiernon, in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, XIV (1960), cols. 199–205, with an excellent bibliography. Innocent III had received complaints to the effect that Queen Margaret had encouraged Greek bishops in their disobedience to papal mandates (an. XI, ep. 152, in *PL* 215, 1467; Aug. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874–75, no. 3506 [vol. I, pp. 302–3], dated 4 October, 1208).

¹⁵ On the apportionment of the fiefs, which had taken place in the time of Champlitte, see *Livre de la conquête . . . : Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, pars. 128–31, pp. 43–48; *Chronicle of Morea* (Greek version), ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, also ed. P. P.

Thus a dozen or so great baronies gradually came into being, and those who received the titles to them made up with their many vassals the High Court of Achaea. These baronies, generally called by the names of their castles, were Akova or "Matagrifon," in Arcadia, near the modern town of Dimitzana (worth 24 knights' fees); Karytaina, in the region then known as Skortá, in the valley of the Alpheus (22 knights' fees); Patras, apparently worth some 24 knights' fees, and ruled by its archbishop from about 1276; Passavá or Passavant, on the Gulf of Laconia, at the base of the peninsula of Maina (4); Vostitza, the classic Aegium, on the Gulf of Corinth (8); Kalavryta (12) and Chalandritza (4 and later 8), just south of Vostitza and Patras respectively; Veligosti (4), hard by the historic grain field of Megalopolis; Nikli (6), near Tegea and the once famous Temple of Athena Alea; Geraki (6), on a western spur of Mount Parnon, overlooking the Laconian plain; Gritzena (4), which has little Frankish history, near more important Kalamata; the Villehardouin fief of Kalamata, on the Gulf of Messenia; and eventually (after 1260) Arcadia or Kyparissia, on the so-called Gulf of Arcadia, which joins the Ionian Sea.

The original families of the conquest did not long survive—if we may look ahead for a moment—for the barons fought too much, and the summer sun was too strong for fighting in the Morea. When Prince William of Villehardouin, Geoffrey's second son, died in 1278, only the northern baronies of Chalandritza and (possibly) Vostitza were still in the possession of the founding families,¹⁶ and by this time too the baronies of Passavá, Geraki, and Kalavryta had already been retaken by the Greeks, now established in Mistra. Later on, when the so-called Assizes of Romania were codified in their present form (possibly between 1333 and 1346), the twelve peers of the prince of Achaea were said to be:

Kalonaros, Athens, 1940, vv. 1903–2009; and cf. *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 115–37, pp. 28–32, an interesting but anachronistic mélange, on which see David Jacoby, "Quelques Considérations sur les versions de la 'Chronique de Morée,'" *Journal des Savants*, 1968, pp. 165 ff. William Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 50 ff., follows the Greek Chronicle rather closely; cf. Peter W. Topping, *Feudal Institutions, as Revealed in the Assizes of Romania* (Univ. of Penna. Translations and Reprints, 3rd ser., vol. III), Philadelphia, 1949, pp. 116–17.

¹⁶ Cf. Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque*, Paris, 1969, pp. 459, 464.

the duke of Athens; the lord of Naxos; the triarchs of Negroponte; the lord of Boudonitza; the count of Cephalonia; the lords of Karytaina, Patras, Matagrifon, and Kalavryta; together with the marshal of the principality, "as long as he is in the army and in authority over the soldiers."¹⁷ Those to whom had fallen the twelve great baronies of the conquest, together with certain other "barons of land," who possessed high justice (*iurisdiction de sangue*) and an episcopal see in their own territory, were alone empowered to build castles in the principality of Achaea without the express permission of its prince.¹⁸

Great castles arose in every important barony,¹⁹ and military service was required of most feudatories who did homage for a holding in the conquered territory. Often such service far exceeded the customary "forty days and forty nights" of Anglo-Norman and French feudalism. If the rewards were great in this unpromised land, the dangers were no less great. Vassals might be required to give four months' service in the field, four more in watch and ward of castles; and four months could be spent at home, although their liege lords could summon them at will for the performance of their duties in a land that knew but little peace.²⁰ At the age of sixty, which few knights and barons of the

¹⁷ Georges Recoura, ed., *Les Assises de Romanie*, Paris, 1930, art. 43, p. 191 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 258); Engl. trans. by P. W. Topping, *Feudal Institutions*, p. 41. Although the *Chronicles of the Morea* assign the date 1209–1210 to the review of the apportioned fiefs by Geoffrey I of Villehardouin, by and large the list of fiefs and their holders as given in the *Chronicles* reflects rather the situation in the Morea when Geoffrey II succeeded his father about 1228 (see Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp. 82–83, 102–15, 128, on the Moreote baronies). The Greeks probably retook Kalavryta shortly after 1270 (cf., *ibid.*, p. 468); written versions of the Assizes obviously preserved anachronisms, as that still listing *lo signor de Collovrat* as a peer of the principality. The list of the twelve peers, as given in the Assizes, art. 43, derives from the period after 1262 (David Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale: Les "Assises de Romanie," sources, application et diffusion*, Paris, 1971, pp. 24–25). On the background of the Assizes, with their compound of Latin practice, Byzantine influence, and Jerusalemite traditions, see Jacoby, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–44 ff., 62, 70 ff., 105 ff., and on the date, *ibid.*, pp. 75–82.

¹⁸ *Assises de Romanie*, art. 94, ed. Recoura, p. 222; trans. Topping, p. 57.

¹⁹ Longnon, *Chronique de Morée*, pars. 218–19, p. 79; Schmitt, *Chron. of Morea*, vv. 3145–72.

²⁰ *Assises de Romanie*, art. 70, ed. Recoura, pp. 209–10; trans. Topping, p. 51; Longnon, *Chronique de Morée*, par. 130, p. 147; Schmitt, *Chron. of Morea*, vv. 1995–2001; Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos*, par. 138, p. 32.

generation following the conquest could have reached, the vassal was relieved of personal service, but he must send his son to serve for him or, if he had no son, a proper substitute.²¹ As usual in the Latin states in Greek territory no baron could grant feudal land to ecclesiastics, burgesses, or Greek serfs (who did not bear arms) without the express permission of the prince of Achaëa.²²

In addition to his High Court (*la Haute Court*), composed of the lieges and bishops of the principality, the prince of Achaëa is said to have possessed a Low Court (*la Court de la Borgeie*), which allegedly met under the presidency of a viscount,²³ to hear non-feudal cases involving the burgesses of the land, their possession of vineyards, tenure of houses and lots in the towns, disputed commercial transactions not settled out of court by the law merchant, and so on. Almost forty articles in the Assizes of Romania depict for us the poor condition of the serfs in the principality of Achaëa, and the lot of the serfs in continental Greece was doubtless the same as that of their unfortunate fellows in Achaëa. The Assizes declare explicitly that "when a serf is wronged no matter how much by his lord, he cannot lodge a complaint against him with the superior lord nor appeal to him regarding the injury which his lord inflicted."²⁴ The male serf could be freed from his bondage only by the prince himself (art. 25 of the Assizes);²⁵ his

female counterpart acquired permanent freedom by marriage with a free man, *cum homo liberto* (art. 125); but, for the rest, the serf could be given away, exchanged, or claimed at law like any other property on the manor (arts. 25, 107, 203, 211). If it should happen that a feudatory (*lo homo legio*) killed a serf by accident, he was obliged to replace the dead serf by one just as good (art. 151). "And a serf cannot marry his daughter or contract marriage himself without the permission of his lord" (art. 174). A female vassal who married a serf lost her freedom and the produce of her fief so long as she lived in this mésalliance, and her sons by the serf were serfs, and could not succeed to her fief, although her fief was recoverable if her husband predeceased her, for she then resumed her former status (arts. 78, 180). If a serf died without heirs of his body, the lord was his heir (art. 185), although the lord did not have to await the serf's death to take his personal property, *li beni mobelli*, provided he left the poor creature enough to live on (art. 197). Although a serf could give testimony concerning a vineyard, a piece of land, or another serf, he could not do so concerning a fief (art. 175), and "a Greek serf cannot be a witness against a liegeman in a criminal case involving life or limb" (art. 198).²⁶ All serfs were Greek. Undoubtedly their life was a miserable one, possibly worse than it had been under their native *archontes*; by and large, however, they were left in the immediate possession of their lands and homes.²⁷

The conquest of the Morea was actually a slow process. Few Greeks fled, and few were killed. The Latin conquerors, who could conceive only of a society based on feudalism, received and granted fiefs [*feuda*, τὰ φέε], which were finally described as *pronoiai*, as in the Greek Chronicle of the Morea. After the conquest, however, the Greek *archontes* continued to hold much of their land as non-feudal, patrimonial possessions although, as time passed, various

²¹ *Assises de Romanie*, art. 89, ed. Recoura, p. 219; trans. Topping, p. 56. The text of the Assizes exists today only in a dozen late manuscripts which preserve copies once used by Venetian authorities in the Greek territories of the Republic (cf. Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp. 18–19, 85 ff., and Jacoby, in *Travaux et mémoires* [du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantines], II [Paris, 1967], 446 ff., and esp. the detailed analyses in *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, pp. 95–174).

²² *Assises de Romanie*, art. 96, ed. Recoura, p. 223; trans. Topping, p. 58; cf. arts. 25 and 183; and Jacoby, *Travaux et mémoires*, II, 459–60.

²³ Cf. *Assises de Romanie*, prolog. I, ed. Recoura, pp. 147–48: "... do Corte seculare, la una se clamava l'Alta Corte e l'altra, Bassa Corte, zoe la Corte de li Borgei, a le qual elo [i.e. Duke Godfrey of Bouillon, upon the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem] stabeli uno homo per esser governador et justicier in luogo de luy, lo qual fo appellato Visconte" (p. 147). The principality of the Morea is said by the *Assises de Romanie* to have been organized in deliberate imitation of the kingdom of Jerusalem founded more than a century earlier. For the assembly of the burgesses (in their court?) for political action, see *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 2256, 3209, 5848, 8632.

²⁴ *Assises de Romanie*, art. 186, ed. Recoura, p. 276; trans. Topping, p. 89.

²⁵ Cf., however, art. 139, which allows the feudatory to free his serf and protect him in his new status by "letters of manumission" (*le letere de la donation et libertade*).

²⁶ *Assises de Romanie*, ed. Recoura, p. 282; trans. Topping, p. 92. In general, cf. Topping, *op. cit.*, pp. 173–74; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 57–58; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 209–11. There is some information on the life of the serfs on some of the ecclesiastical estates of Patras in Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 159 (misnumbered in Migne), in *PL* 216, 336–37, and see in general D. A. Zakythinos, "La Société dans le despotat de Morée," in *L'Hellénisme contemporain*, 2nd ser., V (March–April, 1951), 101–8, and *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, II (Athens, 1953), 201 ff.

²⁷ Cf. *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, par. 134, p. 31: "... et á todos los ... villanos siervos dexaron en sus posesiones, et á todos los otros lauradores confirmaron en los censuales que tenian. ..."

prominent pro-Latin archontes were knighted, received fiefs requiring military service, and were thus drawn into the feudal nexus. There had been no feudalism, no homage and no vassalage, in Byzantine society before the Latin conquest, and there is little or no evidence that pronoiā existed in the Morea before the advent of the Fourth Crusaders. When the author of the Greek Chronicle uses the word pronoiā, he may mean fief, but his language has for the most part a poetic imprecision. The paucity of documents makes it very difficult to be sure how widespread the pronoiā was in the Byzantine empire during the years before 1204, for there is hardly any evidence for the existence of the pronoiā in Epirus or the region around Smyrna, Cyprus, the Venetian territories in Romania (including Crete), or in the island of Chios.²⁸ In time of course the position of the local Greek archontes

came closely to resemble that of the Latin lords in the Morea.

It is impossible to say to what extent the free village communities of the past—as well as, here and there, some isolated hamlets of free peasants—could have survived Latin conquest in the Morea, Boeotia, and Attica. Free peasants had suffered a marked diminution in numbers in Byzantine times, ever since the second quarter of the eleventh century. Few of them could have been left by the time of the Latin establishment in Greece; but there were some, and they appear to be included in some general references to “free men” in the Assizes of Romania (arts. 23, 149, 152).²⁹ Now, however, peasant tenures of whatever degree of freedom or unfreedom were likely to be defined by Latin custom, an alien and unintelligible law, which must have much increased the hardships of those who lived on a barren soil.³⁰

The year 1208 was probably far advanced when Guillaume of Champlitte learned of the death of his elder brother Louis in Burgundy. Louis had left an inheritance which Guillaume set out to claim shortly before his own death

²⁸ See in general the important article by David Jacoby, “Les Archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque,” in *Travaux et mémoires*, II, 421–81, contrary to the thesis maintained by Geo. Ostrogorskiĭ, *Pour l'Histoire de la féodalité byzantine*, trans. H. Grégoire, Brussels, 1954, pp. 55–61: Although the hierarchical structure of political power in the West, the so-called “feudal pyramid,” did not exist in the Byzantine world (and has been exaggerated in western feudalism), Ostrogorskiĭ believes that as far as social and economic relations were concerned there was little difference between the Greek pronoiā and the western fief, and that precisely for this reason the Fourth Crusaders found it easy to settle into the lands of the erstwhile Byzantine empire. In this connection, however, Ostrogorskiĭ employs only the Greek *Chronicle of the Morea* to illustrate his argument, but the Greek Chronicle was undoubtedly translated from a French version between about 1346 and 1388 (see Jacoby, “Quelques Considérations sur les versions de la ‘Chronique de Morée,’” *Journal des Savants*, 1968, esp. pp. 150–58), and is hardly a solid source for the institutional history of the first decade of the thirteenth century, as Ostrogorskiĭ assumes (*op. cit.*, p. 58, note 2). Moreover, the lists of fiefs given in the various versions of the Chronicle do not date from 1209, as Ostrogorskiĭ, *loc. cit.*, thinks, but from about twenty years later, and of course the feudal terminology in the Greek Chronicle is the consequence of a century and a half of Greek experience of western feudalism. Cf. also Miloš Mladenović, “Zur Frage der Pronoiā und des Feudalismus im byzantinischen Reiche,” *Südost-Forschungen*, XV (1956), 123–40, who distinguishes sharply between the Byzantine pronoiā and the western fief, and claims that “apart from certain similarities in their economic aspects the pronoiā and the fief (*feudum*) represented two different worlds” (*ibid.*, p. 131). When a Greek archon was caught up in the Latin feudal nexus, he presumably became westernized (like the author of the Greek *Chronicle of the Morea*), and lived in the social world of the *nova Francia* which the Fourth Crusaders had created in the Morea. On the gradual integration of the chief Greek archontes into the Latin feudality of the Morea, see D. Jacoby, “The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade,” *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (1973), 873–906, esp. pp. 889–903.

²⁹ Cf. Ernst Gerland, *Neue Quellen zur Gesch. d. latein. Erzbistums Patras*, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 84–87, with refs.; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 210.

³⁰ The free village community still survived in the late eleventh century, in Boeotia for example, although the number of large landowners was increasing ominously. Thus the fragment of the cadastral register of Thebes, published by N. G. Svoronos, “. . . Le Cadastre de Thèbes,” *Bull. correspondance hellénique*, LXXXIII (1959), 1–145, esp. pp. 141 ff., shows that many estates in Boeotia were still privately owned by small as well as by large proprietors, there being apparently few estates of truly latifundian extent. Incidentally, many of the Boeotian landowners were Italiote Greeks, especially from Sicily, who had apparently received lands in the area after the Bulgarian devastations of the tenth and early eleventh centuries. It is hard to say how much the freedom of such landowners had suffered attrition during the twelfth century. But it would probably not do to entertain any illusions about “freedom” among the Byzantine peasants by the time of the Fourth Crusade. Constant warfare and the Turkish occupation of Anatolia had produced many “free men” (ἐλεύθεροι), who were actually impoverished refugees, and are referred to in the sources as “indigents” (πτωχοί) and as “strangers” (ξένοι). Although the Byzantine village community certainly survived as a social (and taxable) unit, the extent to which the inhabitants of the village were free remains highly problematical. Nevertheless, “serfs” (πάροικοι) clearly retained various rights to buy and sell lands, vineyards, and other holdings. See in general the interesting lectures of G. Ostrogorskiĭ, *Quelques Problèmes d'histoire de la paysannerie byzantine*, Brussels, 1956, esp. pp. 34 ff.; cf. also his article on “La Commune rurale byzantine,” in *Byzantion*, XXXII (1962), 139–166, esp. pp. 158 ff.; and note the critical review of Svoronos's study by J. Karayannopoulos [Karagiannopoulos], in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVI (1963), 361–70.

some time early in 1209. Guillaume entrusted his lands in the Morea to a nephew, who also died very shortly, and so by the beginning of May, 1209, when Geoffrey of Villehardouin appeared at the parliament of Ravennika, he came as the ruler of the Morea. At Ravennika the Emperor Henry made Geoffrey the seneschal of Romania, but some time was still to elapse before he was able to assume, as Guillaume's successor, the title Prince of Achaia. In the partition treaty of 1204 the Venetian Republic had received most of the Morea, except for Corinthia and the Argolid; but here, as almost everywhere, with so many irons in the fire, S. Mark had been slow to take what had been given him. The Republic had, however, occupied and by now fortified both Modon and Coron, on either side of the Messenian promontory. The relations of Venice and Villehardouin had doubtless been discussed and probably almost settled at Ravennika in May, and so late in June (of 1209) a treaty could quickly be made between the two. It was negotiated on the island of Sapienza, off the harbor of Modon.

Geoffrey acknowledged himself to be the vassal of the Republic for all that land, now his, which Venice had been awarded in the partition treaty, from the southwest of the Morea, where the Venetian occupation stopped, "all the way to Corinth," *usque Corinthum*. This city he was also to hold of Venice when Acrocorinth could be taken from the Epirote Greeks, who had succeeded Sgourus. The Venetians acquired, in addition to the usual freedom "in their persons and their goods," complete exemption from commercial duties together with a "church, a market, and a court in whatsoever of my cities they might wish."³¹ On the other hand, Villehardouin and his heirs and successors were to receive Venetian citizenship, own a house in Venice, and

present the Republic with three silk broadcloths a year, one for the doge and two for the basilica of S. Mark. Satisfied that their commercial interests in the Morea would be protected, the Republic apparently aided Villehardouin in his personal acquisition of the new title and lands of the Champlitte.

Villehardouin could thus become ruler of the Morea in his own right after successfully avoiding the departed Guillaume's Moreote heir, one Robert, if there is any truth in the elaborate story told in the *Chronicles of the Morea*, for the period of a year and a day allowed the feudal claimant to take up his inheritance. Robert was prevented from reaching Villehardouin, who contrived to keep him at a distance during the allotted time by a series of events, few of which were accidental, and which read like a romance, but are recounted as history by the Moreote chroniclers.³² However this may be, letters drafted in the papal chancery on and after 22 March, 1210, give Villehardouin the august title "prince of Achaia" (*princeps Achaiae*).³³

The partition treaty of 1204 had, in the beginning, awarded Venice not only most of the Morea, but also among other territories the

³¹ *Pactum Principis Achaiae Goffredi* (1209), in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II (1856), doc. CCVII, pp. 97 ff.: ". . . et Veneti in quacunque civitate mea vellent, debent habere ecclesiam, fondiculum et curiam. . . . De Corintho ita teneor ego et mei heredes et successores domino Duci, quam de alia terra." Cf. Andrea Dandolo, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1209, in the new Muratori, *RSS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 284: "Gofredus etiam de Villa Arduino . . . a Raphaele Goro ducis nuncio principatum Achaye, Coronu et Mothono exclusus, recognovit." Note also Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 59-60; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 112; it is difficult to establish the history of Modon and Coron from 1205 to 1208 (cf. Longnon, *op. cit.*, pp. 73, 90, and Silvano Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1966, pp. 28-31). See in general Bon, *La Morée franque* (1969), pp. 64-67.

³² *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 135-70, pp. 49-59; *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 2096-2427, pp. 146-62, and the *Cronaca di Morea* based on the Greek version, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 430-33; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 148-87, pp. 34-43. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 60-61, enjoys the story, and tells it well, although one must agree with Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 113-15, that it contains more fiction than fact, but there is apparently a basis of truth for the view that Villehardouin defrauded the heir or heirs of Champlitte (cf. the observation of Philippe d'Ibelin, in the *Assises de Jérusalem*, ed. Count Beugnot, *Recueil des hist. des Croisades: Lois*, II [Paris, 1843], 401). According to the *Assises de Romanie*, art. 36, ed. Recoura (1930), p. 184, the heir to a vacant fief had two years and two days within which to claim his inheritance, although the *Chronicles of the Morea* indicate that a year and a day had been specified as the time within which Champlitte's heir must present his claim in person.

³³ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. XIII, nos. 23-24 (PL 216, 221D-222), dated 22 March, 1210 (in Potthast, *Regesta*, nos. 3939-40 [vol. I, p. 340]); *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 2770-72, p. 186; and cf. Jean Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 83-84, and *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin*, Paris, 1939, p. 31. A letter of 4 March, 1210, refers to Villehardouin merely as *nobilis vir G. Romaniae seneschalcus* (an. XIII, ep. 6, in PL 216, 201D; Potthast, no. 3925 [vol. I, p. 339]). It would be hard to say whether Villehardouin took the title of prince himself or whether the pope first addressed him as such, but it seems likely that Villehardouin first called himself prince some time toward the close of the year 1209.

strongholds of Oreos and Carystus on the island of Euboea (Negroponte) as well as Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia.³⁴ Even before the treaty with Geoffrey of Villehardouin which established a lasting harmony between Venice and the Villehardouin, the Venetians had been able to make a similar agreement in March, 1209, with Ravano dalle Carceri, successor to the late Jacques d'Avesnes, and now sole lord of Negroponte (until his death in 1216),³⁵ and in June, 1210, with Michael Ducas of Epirus, who also possessed Acarnania and Aetolia. Michael had been most impressed by the military strength and political acumen which the Latin Emperor Henry of Hainaut had shown in the war with the Lombard barons (in 1208–1209). To ward off an attack by Henry's army in the early summer of 1209 Michael had acknowledged himself to be Henry's vassal, or at least his ally, and proposed the marriage of his eldest daughter to Henry's brother Eustace. The marriage took place. Michael had two other daughters and probably worried little about the one who went to live among the Latins. He had promised Henry and Eustace a third of his domains as a dowry, *la tierce partie de toute ma terre*, as Henri de Valenciennes reports the agreement, but he could afford to be generous and cheerful in making a pledge he knew he would not keep.³⁶ This connection between the ruler of Epirus and the Latin emperor worried the Venetians, however, and it was in fact contrary to the terms of the partition treaty which had carefully defined the imperial territories. Michael now responded, with no less alacrity, to the overtures of the Doge

Pietro Ziani, and, unfaithful to his commitment to Henry, he made obeisance to the Venetians in an elaborate treaty which bound him to the Republic as a vassal for his lands.³⁷ But the ink was scarcely dry upon the drafts of the treaty before he attacked the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica in the summer of 1210. With Latin mercenaries in his army, Michael ravaged widely, capturing and executing the constable Amédée Pofey together with a number of knights and members of the clergy.³⁸ When the Emperor Henry came west again in an expedition (1210–1211) against Michael and his Bulgarian ally Dobromir Strez, lord of rugged Prosek in the central Vardar valley, Michael turned his attention to the south where he apparently captured Salona, whose lord Thomas I d'Autremencourt was killed in the attack. In the spring of 1212 Michael overran Thessaly to the shores of the Aegean, and in the next two years seized both Durazzo and the island of Corfu from Venice,³⁹ whose suzerainty over his dominions became merely another document in the rich archives of the Republic.

By the agreement negotiated with Ravano dalle Carceri, Venetian suzerainty was recognized over Negroponte,⁴⁰ but it was a long time before the Republic acquired dominion over the entire island.⁴¹ Jacques d'Avesnes' great seign-

³⁴ Tafel and Thomas, I, 468–73; Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge . . .*, Paris, 1959, pp. 76–78; and on the history of Negroponte after 1204, see D. Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale* (1971), pp. 185 ff.

³⁵ Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 282, 284. On the triarchs of Negroponte, see Louis de Mas Latrie, "Les Seigneurs tiers de Négrepont," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, I (Paris, 1893, repr. 1964), 413–32, and esp. R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280: Regestes et documents," in *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), 235–71, regg. nos. 7–8, 15, 21–24.

³⁶ Henri de Valenciennes, *Hist.*, pars. 688–94, ed. Longnon (1948), pp. 118–21; Innocent III, *Epp.*, an. XIII, no. 184, ed. Theod. Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III (1198–1216)*, Città del Vaticano, 1944, no. 173, pp. 402–3, and *PL* 216, 353D–354A, dated 7 December, 1210; R. L. Wolff, "A New Document from the Period of the Latin Empire of Constantinople: the Oath of the Venetian Podestà," *Annales de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves de l'Université de Bruxelles*, XII (1952) [= *Mélanges H. Grégoire*, IV], 548–49; and cf. D. M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957, pp. 28 ff.

³⁷ Tafel and Thomas, II, 119–23, docs. dated June 1210; Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 284; Lorenzo de Monacis, *Chron. de rebus venetis*, ed. F. Cornelius, Venice, 1758, pp. 144–45, app. to Muratori, *RISS*, vol. VIII.

³⁸ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. XIII, no. 184, ed. Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III*, no. 173, pp. 402–3, doc. dated 7 December, 1210, and *PL* 216, 353–54.

³⁹ Cf. Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros*, pp. 36–39.

⁴⁰ Tafel and Thomas, II, 89–96, docs. dated March, 1209, and (*more veneto*) February, 1211, on which cf. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiers de Négrepont . . .," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), regg. nos. 8, 15, pp. 239–40, 241. Certain commitments which Ravano's procurators made on his behalf to the doge and commune of Venice in March, 1209 (T. and Th., II, 90–91) were renewed after his death by the triarchs in November, 1216 (*ibid.*, II, 176–78; Loenertz, *op. cit.*, no. 23, pp. 243–44), and repeated again with important extensions by the triarchs in June, 1256 (T. and Th., III, 14–15), on which see below. In Negroponte as elsewhere in "Romania" the Venetians sought to ease for the Greeks the social strain of the conquest of 1204: "Grecos vero tenere debemus in eo statu, quo domini Emanuelis tempore [i.e. Manuelis I Comneni, 1143–1180] tenebantur" (*ibid.*, II, 183, and cf. pp. 92, 178).

⁴¹ A century later (on 28 March, 1310) the Doge Pietro Gradenigo reminded King Frederick II of Sicily that even the city of Negroponte was not wholly subject to Venetian jurisdiction (Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Lettere del Collegio, 1308–1310, fol. 73^r [the numbering of folios and

itory had been divided by Boniface of Montferrat in August, 1205, into three large fiefs, to be held by "triarchs" (*terzieri*, *tierciers*), and these had been given to Ravano dalle Carceri and two other gentlemen of Verona, of whom one died and the other went back home. After Ravano's own death (in 1216) the Venetian bailie in Negroponte superintended the division of these fiefs among six heirs⁴² and, in the decades that followed, Venetian influence was of course to grow and to remain paramount in Negroponte until the fall of the island, defended valiantly but in vain, to the Turks in the midsummer of 1470. In this respect the agreement with Ravano, who had no sons and too many other relatives to found a dynasty, differed from that made with Geoffrey of Villehardouin, for Venetian rule never penetrated very far into the interior of the Morea. While both these accords stood out in strong contrast to the abortive attempt to bring Michael Ducas into an alliance with S. Mark, the turbulent careers of the rulers of Epirus were to show that they could not recognize an ally when they saw one.

In 1210 the renewed efforts of Geoffrey of Villehardouin achieved the surrender of Corinth, which had been under siege for five years. He took the city from Michael Ducas's brother Theodore. Othon de la Roche gave him effective assistance. Many Corinthians are alleged to have sought refuge, upon the fall of their city, in the rocky fastness of Monemvasia, for centuries a suffragan see of Corinth, but from this time a city of ever increasing importance as a center of Hellenism in the Morea.⁴³

documents in this register is rather chaotic], cited with the wrong date by Gregorovius, *Stadt Athen*, I [1889], 431–32, note 3, and Greg.-Lampros, I [1904], 512, note, and with the date corrected in Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, p. 193, note 2: "serenitati regie rescribimus quod civitas Nigropontis non est tota nostre iurisdictioni supposita, sed solum quedam pars eius, que est supra mare, propter quam ex forma pactorum [especially those of 14 June, 1256] que cum dictis dominis Lombardis habemus a venientibus per mare commercium possumus accipi facere." Venice did not take over the whole island until 1390.

⁴² Cf. the *Estratti degli Annali veneti di Stefano Magno*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), pp. 179–80; Tafel and Thomas, II, 175–84; Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne* (1959), pp. 93–94; Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tierciers," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 5, 21–24, pp. 238, 243–44.

⁴³ Monemvasia did not fall until 1248, when it was taken by William of Villehardouin. It was reoccupied by the Greeks, however, after the battle of Pelagonia, and was raised to metropolitan status by the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus in 1261 (Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 [1932], no. 1897a. p. 39;

Corinth, however, remained a place of some importance. Its commerce, chiefly in Latin hands, was sufficient for Villehardouin to make Othon de la Roche a grant of four hundred hyperperi a year from Corinthian tolls.⁴⁴

In the months that followed, Nauplia was also taken, and early in 1212 the stronghold of Argos, where Theodore Ducas had stored the treasure of the Church of Corinth when he had given up the city, likewise fell into the hands of Villehardouin and Othon de la Roche, who declined to restore to the new Corinthian archbishop and his clergy what they looked upon as their rightful possessions.⁴⁵ On 25 May, 1212,

V. Laurent, in the *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX [1930], 184–86; and St. Binon, *ibid.*, XXXVII [1938], 277–78). The *Praxis of Corinth* of 1397 dates the establishment of Monemvasia as a metropolis from the Fourth Crusade (F. Miklosich and J. Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, 6 vols., Vienna, 1860–90, II [1862], 287, 289). Isidore, later metropolitan of Kiev, in a petition which he prepared in 1429 to the Patriarch Joseph II, on behalf of the metropolitan of Monemvasia, who claimed Maina and Zemena as his suffragan sees (a claim disputed by Corinth), asserts that Monemvasia, when it fell into Frankish hands, was "then a metropolis and not a bishopric" (*Neos Hellenomnemon*, XII [1915], p. 288, ll. 11–12), which was not the case.

⁴⁴ Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes*, p. 100; Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 6 (*PL* 216, 201D–202), dated 4 March, 1210 (Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 3925 [vol. I, p. 339]), where the fall of Corinth is momentarily expected, according to Innocent III, "... de cura Corinthiorum sollicitudinem decet nos gerere pastorem . . . cum eorum civitas ad dominium Latinorum credatur in proximo perventura vel iam forsitan pervenisse. . . ." Cf. *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 99–102, 191–94, pp. 32–33, 68–69; *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 1528–45, 2791–2823, pp. 104, 106, 186, 188; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 91–99, 188, pp. 23–25, 43; Villehardouin, ed. Faral, II, pars. 324, 331–32; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 240, repr. as *Gesch. Griechenlands*, I (New York, 1960), p. 174; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 62; D. A. Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, I (1932), 14.

⁴⁵ Sanudo, *Istoria*, in Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes*, p. 100; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 199–200, p. 71; *Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 2865–83, p. 192; Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 77 (*PL* 216, 598; Lampros, "Εγγραφα ἀναφερόμενα εἰς τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν Ἀθηνῶν," [cited hereafter as *Eggrapha*; published as vol. 3 of his translation of Gregorovius, Athens, 1906], pt. I, doc. 5, pp. 5–6), dated 25 May, 1212: "... cum nobilis vir Theodorus Grecus quondam dominus Corinthi . . . castrum de Argos nuper tradiderit, quod tenebat, thesaurus Corinthiensis Ecclesie, quem illuc idem Grecus detulerat, est inventus ibidem, quem nobiles viri Gaufridus princeps Achaie, Odo de Rocca, et quidam alii Latini . . . eidem ecclesie restituere contradicunt." The Church of Corinth was immediately organized as a Latin metropolitan see, with seven suffragan bishoprics (Inn. III, an. XV, epp. 58, 61, in *PL* 216, 586D–587, 588, dated 22 May and 18 May,

Pope Innocent wrote the archbishop of Thebes and the bishops of Daulia and Zaratoria to see to the restitution of the Corinthian treasure to the Latin Church of Corinth,⁴⁶ and these worthies must have felt some embarrassment at the task his Holiness thus laid upon them. A week earlier, on 18 May, the pope had written in similar vein to Othon de la Roche, informing him that he was said to hold, "not without peril of his soul," certain villages, properties, persons, abbeys, churches, and all manner of other goods belonging to the Church of Corinth (*quedam casalia, possessiones, homines, abbatie, ecclesie, et omnia bona alia Corinthien. Ecclesie*). His lordship was warned to conduct himself in a manner befitting the good fortune he had received, to have regard for S. Peter and his successor, to restore to our venerable brother, the archbishop of Corinth, the property in question, and compel others to make similar restitution, to watch over and defend the archbishop and his church, so that the Church might know peace under his lordship's protection, and his lordship thus win commendation.⁴⁷ But Othon de la Roche was more interested in the material benefits which

the prince of Achaea might bestow upon him than in the blessings of the pope. At the close of the Moreote campaign in 1212 Villehardouin enfeoffed the newly won Nauplia and Argos to Othon for the loyal assistance he had rendered in winning them and in winning the great stronghold of Acrocorinth, while Othon undertook to be no less useful when Villehardouin should attempt the conquest of Monemvasia, the last Greek stronghold in what William Miller has called, thinking of later Lombard history, the "Peloponnesian quadrilateral."⁴⁸

If the Frankish *conquistadores* were thus grasping and intolerant of ecclesiastical restraint, the pope and the Catholic clergy entertained in their turn too grandiose schemes. There were not to be western settlers enough in Greece at any time or any place to fill up the extensive cadre now planned for those of the Latin obedience in Greece. The first organization of the Latin hierarchy in the Morea consisted of seven episcopal sees, presided over by the archbishop of Patras and the six suffragans under him: the

1212, respectively: Potthast, nos. 4478, 4452 [vol. I, pp. 387, 385]: 1) Cephalonia; 2) Zante; 3) Damala, near the ancient Troezen; 4) Monemvasia, which remained Greek until 1248; 5) Argos; 6) Helos (*Gilas*); and 7) Zemena (*Gimenes*) [PL 216, 587B]. Subsequent needs, however, soon introduced many changes into this structure, which need not concern us here (cf. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 62–63). According to the chronicler Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, a good authority, in *MGH, SS.*, XXIII (1874), 939, Argos was a suffragan see of Athens in 1236, but I do not know whether this is so. (Certainly Argos was a fief of the de la Roche of Athens.) In 1212 the Latins had merely taken over, almost unchanged, the organization of the Greek Church of Corinth, as given in the Greek *Taktika* of the time of the Emperor Leo VI and the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus (Heinrich Gelzer, "Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum," in the *Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wissen., Philos.-philol. Cl.*, XXI [1901], 556); also under the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, about 940 (Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis romani*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 75); and still in the first half of the eleventh century, between 1022 and 1035 (Gustav Parthey, ed., *Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae graecae episcopatum*, Berlin, 1866, not. 3, p. 117). On the Greek Church in the Peloponnesus before the Fourth Crusade, see the general account in Antoine Bon, *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204*, Paris, 1951, pp. 103–13.

⁴⁶ Inn. III, *ep. cit.*, in PL 216, 598B, and Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 5, p. 6.

⁴⁷ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 66 (PL 216, 590; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 4, p. 5); Potthast, no. 4458 (vol. I, p. 385). The same letter was sent to Villehardouin (an. XV, ep. 65, in PL 216, 590).

⁴⁸ Longnon, *Chronique de Morée*, pars. 198–202, pp. 71–72: "Et quant li princes Guillaume [Geoffrey I of Villehardouin] fu en possession dou beau chastel de Naples [Nauplia], si le donna benignement a messire Guillaume [Othon] de la Roche, le seignor d'Atthenes, ou tout la cité et le chastel d'Argues [Argos] avec les appartenances. Et tout ce fist il pour la grant bonté et bone compaignie que il lui tint au siege de Corinte [Corinth], et pour celle qu'il attendoit a avoir ancores de lui a Malevesie [Monemvasia]" (par. 200). Schmitt, *Chron. of Morea*, vv. 2875–83; Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos*, pars. 210–13, p. 48, where the chronology is confused; *Cronaca di Morea (versione italiana)*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.* (1873), p. 436, and Sanudo, *Ist. di Rom.*, *ibid.*, p. 100; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 58, 62; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 115, 117–18. It seems to me that Longnon, who departs from the more or less traditional chronology of events, does not justify his dating from the sources, and hastens by at least ten months the fall of Acrocorinth and the occupation of Nauplia and Argos. Although in his pact of June, 1209, with Venice, Geoffrey of Villehardouin acknowledges that "de Corintho ita teneor ego et mei heredes et successores domino Duci [Petro Ziani Venecie] . . ." (Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, 98), the statement is merely anticipatory of expected success in the siege then in progress. On 4 March, 1210, Innocent III wrote that it was proper for the papacy to exercise pastoral care over the Corinthians "since their city is believed about to come under Latin dominion or perhaps already to have done so" (Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 6, in PL 216, 201D, doc. cited above); it is quite clear that he had not yet received news of the fall of Acrocorinth. Even under the unsettled conditions then obtaining in the Morea, it would hardly take two months to convey a message from the camp at Corinth to the Lateran palace in Rome. Acrocorinth fell early in the year 1210. Cf. Bon, *La Morée franque* (1969), p. 68.

bishop of Olena (near the modern Pyrgos), who resided in the capital city of Andravida, which explains the large number of papal letters addressed to him during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, together with the bishops of Veligosti, Amyclae (Nikli), and Lacedaemonia, and of the Venetian stations of Modon and Coron. Patras became the primatial see in the Morea under the new regime. The first archbishop was one Antelmus, who presided over the Latin Church for some twenty-seven years (1205–1232); his life was full of the usual troubles with his clergy and the unruly baronage. The Hospitallers, Templars, and Teutonic Knights also received some lands and built some strongholds. Only part of the Morea, however, had thus been brought under the control of the Roman Church. When Corinth fell in 1210, its church was immediately organized by the Latins as a second metropolitan see, with seven suffragan bishoprics: the island sees of Cephalonia and Zante; Damala, near the ancient Troezen; Monemvasia, which the Latins did not take until 1248; together with Argos, Helos (*Gilas* in the documents) in Laconia, and Zemena (*Gimenes*) near Corinth. Much of this organization was of course merely on paper, for not only Monemvasia but even Damala, Helos, and Zemena were still in Greek hands. Time, necessity, and further knowledge of conditions in the Morea led the Curia Romana to introduce many changes into this structure.⁴⁹

By the middle of the thirteenth century, in the time of Prince William of Villehardouin, the Latin hierarchy in the Morea consisted of the archbishop of Patras, with his suffragans of Olena, Coron, Modon, and the island see of Cephalonia, together with the archbishop of Corinth, and the Corinthian suffragans of Argos, Lacedaemonia, and Monemvasia.⁵⁰ Thus some sees, which had been found to be too poor to support a bishop or to be without Latin inhabitants enough to require one, had been abolished or, as the case might be, combined with some nearby see which was more prosperous or had a larger Latin population. As far

as the Church was concerned, Innocent III's *novella plantatio Latinorum* could not dig its roots far enough into the soil to produce a tree likely to thrive in the hostile climate of Greek culture.⁵¹

But one much-heralded result of the Fourth Crusade, very important at the time, was the acquisition of a vast number of relics by the conquerors, who enriched many churches and monasteries in France with their finds, which survived, almost by the thousands, until they were destroyed by the French revolutionaries. One of these relics purported to be the body of S. Dionysius the Areopagite, the friend of S. Paul and the first bishop of Athens, patron saint of the abbey of S. Denis in Paris, burial place of the kings of France. From the time of Louis the Pious, in the first half of the ninth century, the monks of the abbey of S. Denis had claimed to possess the body of their patron saint. For some four centuries skeptics and detractors of the abbey had questioned the authenticity of their chief relic, preserved in a great silver reliquary. Now the papal legate in Greece, Peter Capuano, discovered what was alleged to be the Areopagite's body. Peter removed the body to Rome, and Innocent III decided to give it to the abbot of S. Denis, some of whose representatives, having attended the Lateran Council a few months before, were still in Rome, and could thus receive the precious relic destined for their monastery. If, however, the pope could send the body of S. Denis to the monastery which bore his name, obviously the monks had for centuries been extolling the virtues of a false relic.

The pope did not commit himself: "For certain persons assert that Dionysius the Areopagite died and was buried in Greece, and that there was another Dionysius who preached the faith of Christ to the Frankish peoples. According to some it was the latter who came to Rome after the death of S. Paul and was afterwards sent back to France by S. Clement, and so it was quite a different person who died and was buried in Greece, although both Dionysii were dis-

⁴⁹ On the Latin hierarchy in the Morea, see Bon, *La Morée franque* (1969), pp. 92–94, with refs., and cf. D. A. Zakythinos, "The Archbishop Antelmus and the First Years of the Latin Church of Patras" [in Greek], in the *Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, X (1932), 401–17. On the organization of the Corinthian Church, see above, note 45; on the Athenian Church, see below, Chapter 16.

⁵⁰ Cf. Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp. 97 ff.

⁵¹ In this connection note Franz Dölger, "Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten auf dem Balkan und Byzanz," *Südost-Forschungen*, XV (Munich, 1956), 141–59, who sketches the history of the *Frankenherrschaften* in Greece and the Aegean (with various errors in dates), and concludes that the Latin states were little more than an apparatus of colonial exploitation. He claims that the Latins exerted no significant influence on the Greek language, religion, law, or art, and although they made an obvious imprint on later Greek literature, especially the Greek romances, they had no discernible effect upon the Greek mentality.

tinguished in their works and words." Innocent III was very considerate of the feelings of the monks and of the reputation of the abbey. On 4 January, 1216, without taking sides in the controversy, Innocent sent to S. Denis this "sacred memorial of the blessed Dionysius" (*sacrum beati Dionysii pignus*) ". . . so that, since you have both relics, there can be no doubt henceforth but that the sacred relic of the blessed Dionysius the Areopagite is preserved in your monastery."⁵³ One suspects, nevertheless, that there were minds in which doubt persisted, now coupled with amusement.

For more than four years, ever since the first establishment of the crusaders in Greek lands, the newly installed Latin clergy had been at bitter odds with one another and especially with the laity. There had been disputes and even armed conflicts over the possession of churches, monasteries, and other ecclesiastical properties, the collection of the land tax and tithes, as well as the question of testamentary bequests to the Church, forbidden by Villehardouin, de la Roche, and the other barons. Bishops abandoned their sees, and other clerics their special charges, and refused to obey the mandates of their superiors; archbishops refused to provide for their needy suffragans; and the affairs of the Church were in a lamentable confusion.⁵⁴ The rapacious western baronage, which had embarked on this strange crusade, caused much anxiety to Innocent III, who worked with ceaseless vigilance, "lest the rights of the Church should perish through the insolence of the laity."⁵⁴ The Emperor Henry had had a long opportunity to observe the evil state of the Church during his triumphant progress through Thessaly, Boeotia, and Attica, and also on his visit to Negroponte. He now proposed a second parliament to meet at Ravennika a year after the first, this time to arrange between the empire and the Latin Church a concordat which might define their respective rights and bring to an end the internecine strife which kept them both in turmoil. An agreement was reached between the

Latin clergy under the Venetian Tommaso Morosini as patriarch of Constantinople and the Latin feudality under the Emperor Henry at Ravennika on 2 May, 1210. Neither the patriarch nor the emperor attended the parliament in person. Innocent III confirmed the terms of the agreement toward the close of the same year,⁵⁵ perhaps with some reluctance, for he had not been consulted in their formulation.

The original document has not survived, but we know the text and terms of the agreement from its later reaffirmations by the Curia. Thus, a letter of Pope Honorius III, dated 19 January, 1219, confirming the concordat of Ravennika, contains a transcript of Innocent III's own re-issue of the concordat dated 23 January, 1216, which is our nearest document in time to the original settlement of 2 May, 1210. In his letter of 1216, which is addressed to the Latin hierarchy in Greece, Innocent compared himself in his anxious watch over the affairs of the Church, to the provident gardener who sows and weeds with care and diligence, shields his plants from the sun and waters them, to ensure their growth and strength. This was the spirit in which his Holiness now, i.e. in 1216, renewed by his apostolic authority the grant made to the Patriarch Tommaso of blessed memory, with the consent and approval of his most beloved son in Christ, the illustrious Emperor Henry, by the lords and barons who dwelt from the borders of the kingdom of Thessalonica up to the city of Corinth (*commorantes a confinio Thessalonicensis regni usque Corinthum*), the grant, that is, of churches, monasteries, and the like, together with jurisdiction over priests and other ecclesiastical personnel: such was the freedom from lay control promised to the Church by the hitherto difficult and oppressive baronage, except that the Byzantine land tax, known as the *akrostichon*, was to be paid to their lay lords by both the Latin and Greek clergy. Innocent was moved to this pronouncement and renewal of the concordat of 1210, because Pelagius, the cardinal bishop of Albano, when later on he became papal legate in Greece, had unwisely approved other arrangements between the feudatories and the Church.⁵⁶ But Innocent considered the original

⁵³ Inn. III, an. XVIII, *Suppl.*, ep. 201 (PL 217, 241; cf. PL 216, 993A); Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 5043, (vol. I, p. 443).

⁵⁴ Cf. Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. XI, nos. 116-18, 120-21, 152-54 (PL 215, 1434-35, 1467-68); an. XIII, nos. 98-117, 136-37, 151-56, 161 ff. (PL 216, 296-304, 323-24, etc.); *et alibi*.

⁵⁵ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 102 (PL 216, 298D), to the archbishop of Neopatra, dated 7 July, 1210.

⁵⁵ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 192 (PL 216, 360), dated 21 December, 1210.

⁵⁶ The letters announcing the commission of Pelagius as papal legate to the empire of Constantinople were drafted on 30 August, 1213 (Inn. III, an. XVI, epp. 104-6, in PL 216, 901-4; Potthast, nos. 4802-4 [vol. I, p. 418]).

grant of immunity more useful and necessary for the conduct of the affairs of the Latin Church in Greece, and had been advised that it should include even more territory, and extend indeed as far east as Macri (*per loca omnia citra Macram*), thus covering all the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica, to be more in accord with the earlier establishment of ecclesiastical rights and liberties by the late Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, when Cardinal Benedict had dealt with him as papal legate in Romania.⁵⁷

After this laborious introduction of some happily anonymous secretary in the papal chancery we find with much relief, appended to Innocent's letter of January, 1216, the text of the concordat, *de verbo ad verbum*, from which we learn the names of those who subscribed to its terms. Among the ecclesiastics were the Patriarch Tommaso and the archbishops of Athens, Larissa, and Neopatras (Hypate), while among the lay lords appear the names of Othon de la

Roche, the lord of Athens; Guido Pallavicini, the margrave of Boudonitza (Thermopylae);⁵⁸ Ravano dalle Carceri, "lord of the island of Negroponte;" Rainerio da Travaglia of Lamia; Albertino da Canossa; Thomas II d'Autremencourt (*Stromacorth*, *Stromoncort*) of Salona; Count Berthold of Velestino; Nicholas of S. Omer; and William of Larissa. The important ecclesiastics who were concerned, except the patriarch, were present in person, but the barons appear to have been represented by proxies.⁵⁹ The barons professed to be renouncing for themselves, their successors, and their vassals, in favor of the patriarch, "who represented the Church in the name of the lord pope," the possession of all church properties, revenues, and rights, which were to remain forever quit of feudal and manorial charges, *excepto acrostico*, which was to be paid by both Latin and Greek clerics of whatever rank on such lands as they held of lay lords, and at the rate being paid by Greeks on those lands "at the time of the capture of the imperial city of Constantinople."⁶⁰ In the event of clerics, Latin or Greek, failing to pay the *akrostichon*, the barons reserved the right to seize their property to the extent of their debt, but no more, while the persons of such clerics in arrears were to remain free and unattached, and they and their churches were to be guaranteed such possessions as they had in excess of

⁵⁷ The letter of Honorius III, an. III, no. 254 (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 10, fols. 52^r–53^r), "datum Laterani XIII Kal. Febr., pontificatus nostri anno tertio" (fol. 53^r), dated 19 January, 1219, is not given in Potthast, *Regesta*, and is too briefly summarized in the *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. P. Pressutti, I (1888), no. 1816, p. 301. The complete text is printed with the wrong date in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 11, pp. 13–17, where the letter of Innocent III, dated 23 January, 1216 (also not in Potthast), is given in full. Innocent's letter gives our earliest transcript of the concordat of Ravennika (Reg. Vat. 10, fols. 52^r–53^r; Lampros, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–17). The text of the concordat has often been printed from the later confirmation of Honorius III, an. VIII, ep. 47, dated 4 September, 1223, which is to be found in: *Epp. Inn. III*, ed. Étienne Baluze, II (Paris, 1682), 835–37; Migne, *Appendix lib. XVI epp. Inn. III*, in *PL* 216, 970–72; C. A. Horoy, ed., *Honorii III opera omnia*, IV (Paris, 1880), no. 10, cols. 414–16; with summaries in Pressutti's *Regesta*, II (1895), no. 4480, p. 159; Potthast, no. 7077 (vol. I, p. 612); and Jean Longnon, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin: Catalogues des actes des Villehardouin*, Paris, 1939, no. 99, pp. 209–10.

Innocent III's letter of 23 January, 1216, has been most recently printed in Theod. Haluščynskyj, *Acta Innocentii PP. III* (1944), no. 217, pp. 462–65, where it is incomplete and misdated 25 January, and in A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III . . .*, Città del Vaticano, 1950, no. 48, pp. 72–75, where it is now misdated 23 January, 1215, "datum Laterani X Kalendas Februarii pontificatus nostri anno octavo decimo." Innocent's eighteenth year extended from 22 February, 1215, to 21 February, 1216. Despite some carelessness, Haluščynskyj provides good texts of Innocent III's letters relating to ecclesiastical affairs in the East, and gives references to their previous publication by Baluze, Bosquet, Tafel and Thomas, Migne, etc. Tăutu's edition of Honorius III's letters is rather less satisfactory (see below, p. 50, note 25). On the concordat of Ravennika, cf. Gerland, *Latin. Kaiserreich* (1905), pp. 208–9, and Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 123.

⁵⁸ Pallavicini's name appears as *Guido Marchio* in the text in Migne, *PL* 216, 970C, and although it is almost unrecognizable as *Wido Marclo* in the transcription of Lampros, *Eggrapha*, p. 15, the latter has in fact copied this name and others in this passage accurately from the Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 10, fol. 52^r, where Amédée Pofey appears as *Nameus Bovedus* (disregard Lampros's punctuation). Pofey is listed in the text in Migne as *Nameus Roffredus* [for *Boffedus*] *comestabulus regni T[h]essalonici*. As a whole Lampros's transcriptions are fairly accurate.

⁵⁹ For those actually present, see Lampros, *Eggrapha*, p. 17, and Migne, *PL* 216, 972AB. Neither the Patriarch Tommaso Morosini nor the Emperor Henry was at Ravennika in person—nor were Othon de la Roche, Guido Pallavicini, Thomas of Salona, and the other important barons (contrary to the account in Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* [1908], pp. 75–76). The Latin hierarchy in continental Greece, however, was largely present in person. The emperor and the feudality were apparently represented by the chronicler Geoffrey of Villehardouin, "marshal of all the empire of Romania," and some other barons of less importance. The Master Henry, "canon of the Church of Santa Sophia," who also witnessed the concordat of Ravennika (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, p. 17), may possibly be Henri de Valenciennes, historian of the rebellion of the Lombard barons in 1208–1209 (Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 141).

⁶⁰ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pp. 15–16; *PL* 216, 970D–971A.

the debt for which seizure was made. The sons and heirs and wives of Greek clerics, i.e., especially of the rural priests (*papates*), were not to be imprisoned so long as the lords concerned had access to the property of defaulters and could satisfy themselves therefrom "in accord with the amount of the debt." Young Greeks, however, whether of lay or clerical parentage, were liable to feudal or manorial service according to the custom of the region, unless they received ordination as priests themselves, in which case they were to enjoy the same privilege with respect to service as clerics of the Roman Catholic obedience. Among the names of the score of ecclesiastics and ten or so barons who witnessed the acts of Ravennika on 2 May, 1210, we read that of the famous chronicler of the Fourth Crusade, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *Gaufridus, marescalcus totius imperii Romaniae*, but his nephew of the same name, a personage very much to be reckoned with in the affairs of Greece, who had become seneschal of Romania at the first parliament of Ravennika a year before, was not represented at the second, and unfortunately for the Latin Church in the "new France," the concordat of Ravennika did not apply to the lands he was now beginning to rule as the prince of Achaea.⁶¹ Although initiated by the emperor and confirmed by the pope, the concordat did not bring about any marked improvement in the relations between the bishops and barons of continental Greece, who had solemnly pledged their observance of its conditions. There is an old curial adage to the effect that *historia concordatorum*, *historia dolorum*, but the Curia Romana never forgot the terms of Ravennika and sought persistently to secure their observance.

The Curia of Innocent III became thoroughly at home in the affairs of Greece, and its personnel remained largely the same under his successor Honorius III. Until the advent of the Turk, two centuries later, there were few barriers between Italy and Greece. It was not difficult to find in Italy Catholic ecclesiastics who spoke Greek as a native language, and who could be employed on diplomatic missions.⁶² Never-

theless, the division of Christendom into a Greek East and Latin West obviously followed linguistic and ethnic lines. But there were many reasons, apart from language, why the Greek and Latin Churches could not achieve the union which the popes so ardently desired. Discord and disagreement were inevitable between two groups of ecclesiastics who had been brought up with divergent views of the substance and function of canon law. Papal letters were never a significant source of law in the Greek East where, furthermore, S. Augustine was little known and hardly ever read. Greeks and Latins had different conceptions of the meaning and proper organization of the Church as a spiritual reality as well as a hierarchical structure, the body of Christ as well as the assembly of all believers. Different traditions had produced different mentalities, different ecclesiologies.⁶³

In the early thirteenth century Greek Orthodoxy was still satisfied with the traditional religious synthesis which had been largely completed by the Seventh Ecumenical Council (in 787), while the West had been subjecting the dogmatic tradition to constant analysis for three or four generations. The Greeks still adhered to the vague symbols of the past, and were repelled by the intellectual constructs of Latin Catholicism. There were no universities in the Byzantine world and no scholastic theologians

possit celebrare, nullum exinde ecclesiae suae praeiudicium generando." Bishop John, to whom this letter was addressed, was employed less than a year later as papal envoy to Theodore Ducas of Epirus, who then held imprisoned the papal legate Giovanni Colonna. The legate had been captured with the Latin Emperor Peter of Courtenay near Durazzo in the early summer of 1217 as they began their long eastward journey to Constantinople (*cf. Regesta*, I, no. 1024, p. 174, dated 25 January, 1218, and *ibid.*, no. 1029, dated 26 January, and note Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 154–56). On the knowledge of Greek in Italy during this period, see Kenneth M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), *passim*, reprinted in *Europe and the Levant in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, London, 1974, and *cf.* in general Johannes M. Hoeck and Raimund J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole: Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II.*, Ettal, 1965 (*Studia patristica et byzantina*, 11).

⁶¹ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pp. 16–17; *PL* 216, 971–72; *cf.* Longnon, *Geoffroy de Villehardouin*, pp. 100, 209–10.

⁶² *Cf.* Hon. III, an. I, ep. 371, in P. Pressutti, ed., *I Regesti del pontefice Onorio III* . . . , I (Rome, 1884; no more published), no. 455, p. 128; *Regesta*, I (1888), no. 487, p. 86, doc. dated 9 April, 1217: "Iohanni episcopo Crotonensi: Ipsi utriusque linguae, graecae videlicet et latinae, peritiam habenti, et in cuius dioecesi utriusque linguae populus commoratur, concedit [Papa] ut in utraque lingua divina

⁶³ See the interesting study of Yves M.-J. Congar, "Conscience ecclésiologique en Orient et en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle," *Istina*, VI (1959), 187–236, with a rich bibliography, and *cf.* Congar, *L'Ecclésiologie du haut moyen-âge*, Paris, 1968, esp. pp. 321 ff., and *After Nine Hundred Years*, New York, 1959, and also G. Hofmann, "The Idea of the Ecumenical Council as Means of Union in Dealings between Byzantium and Rome," *Unitas*, II-1 (1950), 68–69, 76.

hammering out doctrinal definitions on the iron anvil of dialectic. A Platonic ideality fed the religious mind of Orthodoxy, and theological contradictions seemed not to bother Greek divines who kept reading the patrology and the old conciliar decrees without asking questions. Various doctrines have remained to this day without precise definition in Greek theology. Latin Catholicism may have defined too much, too sharply.

Greeks and Latins spoke different languages figuratively as well as literally. As the eastern mystic became concerned with the divine vision, the juridically minded westerner thought of his moral presentment before God. As reason became the dominant passion of Latin theologians, the Greeks tended to retreat into an ivory tower of spiritual and cultural irrationalism. But there was nothing irrational about the Greeks' rejecting the Roman interpretation of the "primacy of S. Peter." The Greeks had long been accustomed to an ecclesiastical multiformity at marked variance with the authoritarianism of Roman pronouncements on dogma, law, and the liturgy. Even before the Fourth Crusaders had set out, Innocent III had made quite clear to the Emperor Alexius III in a letter of 13 November, 1199, that the Roman see was the *caput et mater omnium ecclesiarum*, and the pope had the right to legislate for the entire Church with the advice and counsel of his fellow bishops.⁶⁴

Sometimes, of course, the Greek and Latin clergies understood each other all too well, and ample reasons could be found for mutual distrust—not least among them the grim fact of the Fourth Crusade. We may note at this point two eloquent expressions of the Greek attitude towards the Latins and their overlordship. While the arrogant papal legate Pelagius, who wore the red boots (*ἐρνυδροβαφῆ πέδιλα*) which connoted imperial rank in Constantinople, was trying to bend the Greeks in the capital to the religious dictates of "the older Rome," a deputation of some of the chief Greek residents of the city informed the Latin Emperor Henry (in 1214):

We are a people of another race [*genos*] and have another head to our Church [*archiereus*]; we have submitted to your power, so you may lord it over our bodies, but not our hearts and souls; while we must fight on your behalf in war, we find it impossible

nevertheless to abandon our religious rites and practices.

Henry gave way, and made life tolerable for the Greek population of the capital and for the Latin regime which was seeking to rule them.⁶⁵ When the Greeks in Constantinople prepared a detailed syllabus of the errors of the Latin Church, to be sent to Innocent III through the cardinal legate Pelagius, they included, towards the end of their statement, a reminder of the ultimate strength of their social position:

We do expect, of course, to have the lord, Sir Henry, as our emperor, and under his shadow to live and do servile things and work our fields and pasture our flocks and sail the sea; but without us the threshing-floor will not be filled with grain, nor the wine-vat with grapes; bread will not be eaten, nor meat, nor fish, nor vegetables; human life and society will not survive. At these tasks do we toil for our Latin brothers, and we gather the fruits of our toil for them, but this is the poorer half of our lives, mortal and frangible; we wish, however, the better half to enjoy the same thoughts as they enjoy, both as long as we live and after death, as we [and they] are parts of a single immortal body.⁶⁶

The history of the Latin states in Greece and the islands is at best a rather confusing subject. It lacks unity, for no one state stands out sufficiently to enable us to group all the others around it and to tell the tale of them all in relation to the most important. Both the historian and the reader are obliged to keep their eyes on numerous participants in events which sometimes have little apparent bearing on one another. Although Michael Ducas's eastward thrust through Thessaly to the Aegean seems to have had, for example, but slight effect on the internal history of Athens and Thebes (at least so far as we are acquainted with that history), it obviously severed easy communication with Thessalonica. Undoubtedly there was much apprehension in Athens and Thebes, and even some in the Morea,

⁶⁴ Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 17 (Bonn, pp. 32–33, and ed. Heisenberg, I, 29–30). There is an adaptation of this passage in the iambic chronicle of Ephraem, *Imperatores*, vv. 7429–57 (Bonn, pp. 301–2). Cf. Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich* (1905), pp. 238–39, and Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 145.

⁶⁵ J. B. Cotelerius [Cotelier], ed., *Ecclesiae Graecae monumenta*, III (Paris, 1686), pp. 516–17 (*Criminationes adversus Ecclesiam Latinam*), cited by Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich* (1905), pp. 239, 240–41, and Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 228–29. A rather similar statement appears in the *Greek Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt (1904), vv. 2089–95, pp. 140 ff.

⁶⁶ Inn. III, *Epp.*, an. II, no. 211 (*PL* 214, 771); Pott-hast, *Regesta*, no. 863 (vol. I, p. 82), and cf. the works of Congar referred to in the preceding note.

as a result of Michael's occupation of so much Thessalian territory and his capture of Salona.

After Michael's death, probably late in the year 1215, the Epirote drive gained even more momentum under his vigorous, hard-hitting half-brother Theodore, who now took over the government in Arta. Although Michael apparently never used the title Despot, Theodore did so on certain coins. The Thessalian magnates had regained their estates in Michael's advance to the Aegean, and they were destined to retain their position until the appearance of the Turks in the later fourteenth century. One of the reasons for this was the withdrawal from Greece of many of the Lombard lords, who made no effort to regain the towns and villages assigned to them after the Fourth Crusade, once the Epirotes had overrun them.

With the support or friendly neutrality of the Albanians and Serbs, Theodore Ducas began his spectacular reign over Epirus by an attack upon the Bulgarians (1216), from whom he seized the important towns of Ochrida and Prilep, extending his northeastern border to the plains of Monastir. Theodore now arranged the appointment of Demetrius Chomatianus (Chomatenos) as the archbishop of Ochrida. Demetrius soon became the official publicist of Epirote ecclesiastical and political claims against those of the rival state of Nicaea, where Theodore Lascaris had been crowned emperor in 1208, arrogating to himself all the rights and sanctions formerly wielded by the Greek rulers of Constantinople.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ Cf. Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 301–13, and on Theodore, see Demetrios I. Polemis, *The Doukai: A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London, 1968, pp. 89–90. On Demetrius Chomatianus, see the article by Lucien Stiernon, cited above, in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, XIV (1960), cols. 199–205. There is a succinct summary of Nicene history in Michael Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea*, Oxford, 1975.

Theodore watched with jealous resentment the ever-growing success of his namesake of Epirus, more than once reaching an entente with the Latin imperial government on the Bosphorus, to the self-righteous horror of Epirote officialdom, which regarded Nicene tactics as a breach of pan-Hellenic patriotism. The Latin Emperor Henry was also alarmed by Theodore Ducas's aggressiveness, and early in 1216 marched with an army to Thessalonica, conceivably planning an offensive against him. Henry died there on 11 June; he was not yet forty years of age. There were the customary rumors of poison, his Bulgarian wife being unjustly accused thereof.⁶⁸ His loss was a great one to the Latin cause in Greece, for he had fought like a "second Ares" (ἄντικρυσ Ἄρης).⁶⁹ After his death there was never any hope of winning the Greeks over to the *imperium Francorum* in Constantinople.

⁶⁸ Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, pp. 249–50, with refs., and Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 150–52. On the apparent revival of Hellenism ("Greek nationalism") after 1204, when Greek intellectuals began to call themselves *Hellenes* rather than *Rhomaioi*, see the spirited exposition of A. E. Bakalopoulos [Vakalopoulos], *Ἱστορία τοῦ νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, Thessaloniki, 1961, pp. 43–83, and *Origins of the Greek Nation*, rev. ed. trans. Ian Moles, New Brunswick, N.J., 1970, pp. 27–45, and the discussion of Johannes Irmscher, "Nikāa als 'Mittelpunkt des griechischen Patriotismus,'" *Byzantinische Forschungen*, IV (1972), 114–37. For the use of the terms *barbaroi*, *Hellenes*, *Rhomaioi*, and *Graikoi* by Sphrantzes, Ducas, Critobulus of Imbros, and Laonicus Chalcocondylas, note the article by Hans Ditten, in the *Actes du XII^e Congrès international d'études byzantines* [1961], II (Belgrade, 1964), 273–99.

⁶⁹ Ephraem, *Imperatores*, v. 7735 (Bonn, p. 312), apparently a pun on the Greek pronunciation of Henri as *Ēris* (Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 143). On the Emperor Henry in popular Greek legend and verse (and the adaptation to his career of romantic notions concerning Alexander the Great), see M. I. Manousakas, "Τὸ ἑλληνικὸ δημοτικὸ τραγούδι γιὰ τὸ βασιλεῖα Ἑρρίκο τῆς Φλάντρας," in the Greek journal *Λαογραφία*, XIV (1952), offprint of 52 pp., and, *ibid.*, XV (1954), 336–70.

3. THE CHANGING FORTUNES OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND ACHAEA, EPIRUS AND NICAEA (1216-1246)

WITH the death of Henry d'Angre of Hainaut in June, 1216, the strength and hope of the Latin empire also expired. Its survival for two more generations is one of the most extraordinary facts in the Latin history of Greece.¹ Henry was succeeded as Latin emperor by his brother-in-law, the headstrong and unruly Peter of Courtenay, husband of his sister Yolande. Peter was one of the richer barons in France, having received the counties of Auxerre and Tonnerre from his first wife and that of Namur from his second. Leaving his sons Philip and Robert to protect the family's interests in France, Peter with Yolande and their daughters set out over the hills and far away to the empire that awaited them in the East. At the head of an army of 160 knights and 5,500 mounted men and footsoldiers, Peter went first to Rome, where Pope Honorius III rather reluctantly crowned him in the church of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura (on 9 April, 1217),² the

ceremony taking place just outside the historic Aurelian wall, lest it seem to compromise the rights of the young Emperor Frederick II, who had a few years before become the papal candidate for Holy Roman Emperor. Although Frederick had already been crowned twice before April, 1217, his imperial coronation by the pope in Rome had not yet taken place (Honorius was to crown him in Rome on 22 November, 1220). At the time of Peter of Courtenay's coronation in S. Lorenzo relations between the pope and Frederick were rather delicate, the latter thrusting himself forward as a crusader anxious to recover the Holy Land, and the Curia Romana apparently reluctant to see him at the head of the undertaking which Innocent III had bequeathed to the papacy as unfinished business. In the East the Fifth Crusade was getting under way, preparing for the siege of Damietta, and hope was still running high at the papal court that the rulers of Egypt and Damascus might be defeated,³ and Jerusalem regained, under other than imperial auspices.

After his coronation Peter of Courtenay crossed the Adriatic on Venetian ships from Brindisi with the papal legate Giovanni Colonna, cardinal priest of S. Praxedis, later the great clerical Ghibelline. Landing at Durazzo, whence by the Via Egnatia ten or a dozen days' march might have carried him to Thessalonica, Peter laid siege to Durazzo, seeking to wrest it from the Epirotes in order to restore it to the Venetians, an ill-advised venture in which he failed completely. He also earned the immediate enmity of Theodore Ducas. After much waste of time and effort, Peter abandoned the siege of Durazzo, and began his hazardous journey across the peninsula toward Thessalonica and Constantinople, but some days later he fell into a trap set by the wily Theodore, and ended up in an Epirote dungeon, from which he never emerged.⁴

¹ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, II (Vienna, 1856), 205-7; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938-48), 288; Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1959, pp. 89-90. In August, 1219, for example, Jacopo Tiepolo, Venetian podestà in Constantinople (and later the doge), negotiated a treaty of peace with Theodore Lascaris of Nicaea for five years, and in the mid-fourteenth century the ducal chronicler Andrea Dandolo observed that Tiepolo did so "since the power of the French was already failing" (*cum iam Gallorum potentia evanesceret*). Always realistic, the Venetians could recognize a serious situation when they saw one. On the increasing confidence to be found in Nicaea and "the mentality of 'Byzantium in exile,'" see N. Oikonomides, "Cinq Actes inédits du patriarche Michel Autôreianos [1208-1214]," *Revue des études byzantines*, XXV (1967), 113-45.

² The Emperor Peter confirmed the partition treaty of 1204 two days after his coronation, by an act given in the Lateran palace in Rome on 11 April, 1217 (Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, 193-95). On the coronation, see Corrado di Fabaria, *Casus S. Galli*, 8, in *MGH*, SS., II (Hanover, 1829), 171: "Consecratus est autem imperator [Petrus] non in ecclesia beati Petri, sed in ecclesia beati Laurencii extra muros." Cf. also Honorius III, *Epp.*, an. I, no. 525, in *I Regesti del pontefice Onorio III*, ed. Pietro Pressutti, I (Rome, 1884), no. 464, p. 130; *Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. Pressutti, I (Rome, 1888), no. 497, p. 88; Aug. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874-75, no. 5517 (vol. I, p. 485), doc. dated 12 April, 1217; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1217, nos. 4-7, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), pp. 404-5.

³ On the chronology of events, cf. Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 89 ff., and on papal relations with Egypt in the 1240's, note, *ibid.*, II (1913), 327 ff. See in general K. M. Setton *et al.*, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, II (Philadelphia, 1962; 2nd ed., Madison, Wisc., 1969), chaps. xi ff., pp. 377 ff.

⁴ Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1217,

Cardinal Giovanni, who had been captured with Peter, spent long months in prison from which, however, the threats and persistence of Honorius III finally rescued him. The Empress Yolande, who was pregnant, had gone by sea with her daughters to Constantinople where she gave birth to her third son, Baldwin [II], apparently in the purple chamber of the imperial palace. On the Bosphorus she reigned in the loneliness of widowhood over an empire which like her had already seen its best days. She died in late September, 1219, and after a regency exercised chiefly by Cardinal Giovanni, her son Robert came from France to Constantinople, his elder brother Philip having declined the succession. Robert arrived in March, 1221, and was crowned emperor in the palace chapel of Boukoleon, and began a decade of feeble rule in a time when strength was needed.⁵ The subsequent history of the Latin empire might have been very different had the impetuous Peter actually ruled in Constantinople. If his reign might have lacked the peace and diplomatic satisfactions of that of his wife Yolande, it would also have lacked the perilous ineptitude which marked Robert's imperial efforts: *Latini perdiderunt multa cum ille [Robertus] esset quasi rudis et idiota*.⁶

In 1218 Theodore Ducas and his brother Constantine had captured the important castle

towns of Neopatras and Zeitounion, on the northern boundaries of the Latin march of Boudonitza. (Neopatras is the modern Hypate; Zeitounion, the ancient Lamia; and Boudonitza was at the pass of Thermopylae.) Theodore also took the fortress promontory of Platamona in Thessaly, sentinel of the Gulf of Thessalonica, just north of the classical vale of Tempe—an important acquisition in which John Apocaurus, the good bishop of Naupactus (Lepanto), gloried as being the prelude to Theodore's occupation of Thessalonica, the big fish for which the Epirote ruler was casting his net.⁷ Next Prosek on the Vardar fell to Theodore in 1219, and two years later he captured Serres from the Latins, cutting the road between Thessalonica and Constantinople. To the west of Thessalonica the towns of Berrhoea and Castoria capitulated, and Servia in northern Thessaly was occupied without a struggle. Many other towns and villages also fell under Theodore's dominion, which now extended from Durazzo on the Adriatic south to Naupactus where the Corinthian Gulf empties into the Ionian Sea. His northern boundary stretched somewhat uncertainly from Durazzo and the valley of the river Drin (the ancient Drilon) eastward to the lower reaches of the Vardar and the Strymon, thus including most of ancient Paeonia, Macedonia, and the lands southwest of the Rhodope mountains. His eastern border, which commanded his most diligent attention, descended from Serres and Berrhoea, Servia and Platamona, through Larissa and Zeitounion to Naupactus. It was the most powerful state in the Balkans.

Theodore had now wielded the scepter of Epirus for a mere half dozen years, but his victories had been such as to fasten the eyes of the Greek world upon him as the conqueror of the Latins and the champion of Orthodoxy. He had climbed the steep hill of success rapidly, always knowing whom to attack and when. To the south the Latin principality of Achaea had also prospered. Theodore had confined his campaigns to continental Greece; Thessalonica and Constantinople were his ultimate goals. Very wisely he never ventured into the

in *MGH, SS.*, XXIII, 906; *Geo. Acropolites, Chron.*, 14 (Bonn, pp. 28–29, and ed. Aug. Heisenberg, I [Leipzig, 1903], 25–26); Riccardo di S. Germano, *Cron.*, ad ann. 1217, in Muratori, *RSS*, VII (Milan, 1725), col. 990, and *MGH, SS.*, XIX (1866), p. 339, lines 1–6.

⁵ Cf. Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople*, Paris, 1949, pp. 153–60. Immediately upon his arrival in Constantinople the Emperor Robert confirmed the partition treaty of 1204 (Tafel and Thomas, II, 227–30). Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RSS*, XII-1, 287, 288–89. Cardinal Giovanni Colonna, as is well known, was present at the taking of Damietta in 1219, and brought to Rome the "column of flagellation," still preserved in the Church of S. Praxedis. He transferred his support to the Ghibellines in 1240, after which the Colonnese long preserved their so-called imperial loyalties (cf. É. van Cauwenbergh, in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, III [Paris, 1956], 335). He died on 9 February, 1244.

⁶ Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1220, in *MGH, SS.*, XXIII (1874), 910, lines 42–43. Following the death of Yolande, to whom rather than to her husband Peter the barons of Constantinople had taken the oath of fealty, Conon of Béthune was made bailie of the Latin empire. Conon died in December, 1219 or, possibly, 1220. The young Emperor Robert arrived in Constantinople in March, 1221 (Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 157–59).

⁷ Apocaurus, *Epp.*, no. 4, ed. V. G. Vasilievskii, "Epirotica saeculi XIII," *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, III (1896), 246–48, cited by D. M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957, p. 58. With its well-preserved Venetio-Turkish castle, Platamona is today one of the more picturesque sites in Greece.

Morea, where the opposition would have been too strong and the risks too great.

For some twenty years Prince Geoffrey I of Villehardouin ruled over most of the Morea as an almost independent state. His suzerains were the Latin emperor in Constantinople and the Venetian Republic, but after the death of the Emperor Henry, the imperial power on the Bosphorus counted for little, and the Venetians did not interfere in the affairs of the Moreote principality so long as their own interests were in no way endangered. Geoffrey was an able and sagacious prince who knew how to preserve by a careful administration the state he had helped to found by his enterprise and imagination. He appears, by and large, to have dealt justly with the native Greeks. He had constant trouble with the papacy, for there were causes of strife between the Latin clergy and the feudality in Greece other than Villehardouin's failure to accept and Othon de la Roche's failure to abide by the acts of Ravennika. On 11 February, 1217, Pope Honorius III wrote to the Latin Patriarch Gervasius (1215–1219) of Constantinople that a complaint had been lodged at the Curia on behalf of Villehardouin and de la Roche to the effect that the patriarch had, on his own authority, without reasonable cause, and contrary to the statutes of the General Council (of the Lateran), promulgated decrees of excommunication against them and laid an interdict upon their lands. His Holiness declared, however, that, if such was the case, the patriarch was to relax the sentences passed against Villehardouin and de la Roche within a week of the receipt of the papal letter. The Cistercian abbot of Daphni, in the diocese of Athens; the prior of the cathedral of Athens, the Parthenon (*prior dominici templi Athenien.*); and the dean of the Daulian chapter were all being informed, Honorius wrote, of his decision, and were being instructed to relax the bans against Villehardouin and de la Roche.⁸

Three days later, on 14 February, 1217, the papal chancery dispatched at least three letters to clerics in the domains of the Athenian Megas

Kyr. The abbot of Daphni and the dean of the diocese of Daulia were informed that his Holiness understood, on the complaint of the archbishop and the cathedral chapter of Thebes, that the Patriarch Gervasius claimed the right to hear all cases arising in the archdiocese of Thebes, whether referred to him on appeal or not; that in most uncanonical fashion he excommunicated, and absolved therefrom, both clerics and laymen; that he claimed the right of appointment to vacant livings and prebends although he had never been granted any such right; that, in short, he seemed to discharge the functions of a papal legate although he had never received any privilege to this effect, nor any special mandate from the Holy See. Gervasius had even gone so far as to establish his own procurator in Thebes to exercise there his unwarranted jurisdiction.⁹

The abbot of Daphni, the prior of the Parthenon, and the dean of Daulia were requested in the second letter to investigate and render judgment on the charge, made by the archbishop and chapter of Thebes, "that the patriarch of Constantinople had deprived them of the Church of the Blessed Mary in the marketplace of Thebes [*in foro Thebarum*] and of certain others, too, contrary to justice."¹⁰ The same three ecclesiastics were finally directed, in the third letter of the same date (14 February, 1217), to look into the claim being vigorously pressed by the patriarch, who had come to Thebes himself (*ad Thebanam civitatem accedens*), to certain monasteries, marked with the *signum crucis*, because of their previous possession by

⁸ Honorius III, an. I, ep. 271 (text in Sp. P. Lampros, *Eggrapha*, Athens, 1906, pt. I, doc. 7, pp. 8–9); *Regesti*, I (1884), no. 302, p. 85; *Regesta*, I (1888), no. 332, p. 59. (Honorius often found it necessary to upbraid the arrogant Patriarch Gervasius for his highhanded actions.) About fifteen Latin incumbents of Greek sees had attended the Lateran Council in Rome, among them the archbishops of Athens, Thebes, and Corinth.

⁹ Honorius III, an. I, ep. 267, in *Regesti*, I, no. 312, pp. 87–88; *Regesta*, I, no. 340, p. 60. Gervasius, who had represented the Patriarch Morosini at the concordat of Ravennika in May, 1210, had been appointed to his see by Pope Innocent III at the Lateran Council in 1215, a decision which brought to an end a prolonged dispute over who was to succeed Morosini, who had died in 1211 (see Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 144, 147–48). On Gervasius, see Louis de Mas Latrie, "Patriarches latins de Constantinople," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, III (1895, repr. 1964), 433; Leo Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Patriarchats*, Weimar, 1938, pp. 31–32, 188 ff.; and R. L. Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), 246–54, 274–76.

¹⁰ Hon. III, an. I, ep. 269, in *Regesti*, I, no. 313, p. 88; *Regesta*, I, no. 342, p. 61, and see Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "The Cistercians in the Latin Empire of Constantinople and Greece, 1204–1276," *Traditio*, XIV (1958), 82, 97 ff., 111 ff., who mistakenly assumes that reference in the papal documents to *dominicum templum Athenarum*, i.e. the Parthenon cathedral in Athens, means the Templars (*ibid.*, pp. 97, 99).

the Greek patriarch. We may be sure that the patriarch's right to these monasteries was quite as vigorously denied by the archbishop of Thebes.¹¹ There were now twelve canons in the cathedral chapter at Thebes.¹² We shall have occasion later to observe the unenviable record of disorder they had achieved in the affairs of the Theban archdiocese although they appear to have met at least their match in the Patriarch Gervasius. A year later, in January, 1218, Pope Honorius wrote again to the patriarch, peremptorily ordering him to cease claiming jurisdiction over certain churches merely because they bore the Greek patriarchal sign of the cross, but which apparently belonged to the archbishops, bishops, and certain other prelates in the domains of Geoffrey, prince of Achaea, and Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens. The Latin patriarch claimed as immediately subject to himself all churches bearing the *signa crucis*, i.e. former dependencies of the Greek patriarchate, although his Holiness expressly says the Latin patriarch could buttress his claim by no authorization or special privilege (*licet nullo super hoc jure vel speciali privilegio muniaris*). To assert his right to these churches, therefore, the patriarch must advance some other valid reason and, failing such, must cease to belabor the Achaean and Athenian clergy with his claims. The abbot of Daphni and the prior of the Parthenon cathedral were also instructed to admonish the patriarch to the same effect.¹³

Three months later, on 31 March, 1218, Honorius wrote the patriarch a lengthy epistle, rebuking him for overreaching himself (*tu supra te volens extendere alas tuas*), and sending out legates *a latere* as though he were exercising the apostolic authority of S. Peter's own successor. A patriarchal legate, contrary to the express limitations of the Lateran Council, had laid an interdict upon the lands of Geoffrey, prince of Achaea, and Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens, without reasonable cause, and enjoined upon the prelates of Achaea and the Athenian lordship the inviolable observation of the action he had taken. The pope noted other instances of the patriarch's highhand-

edness, and solemnly protested against such usurpation of the power of the Roman pontiff—"you seem not to have undertaken the care of a pastoral charge," he wrote, "but to have mounted the throne of arrogance and the cathedra of pestilence." Honorius enjoined upon his venerable brother in Constantinople to remember who was subject to whom, and directed him to relax the objectionable and uncanonical bans promulgated in his name: otherwise the bans would be relaxed by the treasurer of the Athenian chapter and the prior and subprior of the abbey of Daphni, who were being instructed to this effect by papal letters.¹⁴ But if the Latin patriarch was presumptuous, so too was the Latin baronage in Greece. To be sure, the prince of Achaea had not subscribed to the concordat of Ravennika, but the lord of Athens had done so and was not living up to the terms agreed upon in May, 1210. Less than a year later, therefore, we find Honorius himself acceding to the formal petition of the Latin episcopacy in Greece to maintain the bans of excommunication and the interdict directed against the chief secular authorities in that alien land where an alien Church could never find peace and security.

On 21 January, 1219, the pope thus wrote to the archbishop, dean, and archdeacon of Thessalonica that, at the behest of the archbishops of Corinth, Patras, Larissa, Athens, and Neopatras, together with their suffragans and the cathedral chapter of Thebes, he confirmed the sentences of excommunication laid upon Geoffrey I of Villehardouin, prince of Achaea, Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens, and their barons, knights, sergeants, councillors, and supporters, and the interdict laid upon their lands by his apostolic legate Giovanni Colonna, the cardinal priest of S. Praxedis, because of their contumacious retention of certain abbeys, churches, rural parishes, and ecclesiastical goods, movable and immovable, contrary to the undertakings they had entered into with the Church in the second parliament of Ravennika, in the time of his Holiness's predecessor, Innocent III, of happy memory.¹⁵

¹¹ Hon. III, an. I, ep. 268, in *Regesti*, I, no. 314, pp. 88-89; *Regesta*, I, no. 341, p. 60.

¹² Hon. III, an. I, ep. 274, in *Regesti*, I, no. 331, p. 93; *Regesta*, I, no. 356, p. 63.

¹³ Hon. III, an. II, ep. 839 (text in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 8, p. 9); *Regesti*, I, nos. 943-44, p. 253; *Regesta*, I, no. 986, p. 168; docs. dated 9 January, 1218.

¹⁴ Hon. III, an. II, ep. 1002 (complete text in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 9, pp. 10-12); cf. *Regesti*, I, no. 1162, p. 303; *Regesta*, I, no. 1206, p. 200; A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III (1216-1227) et Gregorii IX (1227-1241)*, Città del Vaticano, 1950 (Fontes Pontificiae Commissionis ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, 3rd ser., vol. III), no. 30, pp. 53-55.

¹⁵ Hon. III, an. III, ep. 237 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt.

The sentences of excommunication which Cardinal Giovanni Colonna had laid upon the prince of Achaea and the lord of Athens in 1218, as he passed through Greece, and which Honorius III confirmed on 21 January, 1219, endured for almost five years (until 4 September, 1223). It is the function of the Apostolic See, Honorius now wrote to Geoffrey of Villehardouin (4 September, 1223), to maintain control over peoples and states, so that there may be rendered unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's. The insolence of the princes of Romania has caused confusion and corruption; men bestow goods upon churches, and take them away, just as they please. Among offenders Geoffrey himself has been conspicuous; he has kept abbeys and other church properties in his own hands, and spent their incomes upon himself; he has used Greek priests as serfs (*papates tanquam rustici*); and because he has not hearkened to warning and to rebuke, he has been excommunicated. But to those who have learned humility, and would return to the Church, the entrance is never closed, and Honorius now welcomes Geoffrey back into the fold, in a compromise based upon the terms of Ravennika. All the cathedral churches in the principality of Achaea are to have all the possessions they now hold or are known to have held from the coronation of the Emperor Alexius III Angelus, called Bambacoratius (1195–1203),¹⁶ free of all exaction and secular jurisdiction, except for just and due *akrosticha*, which are to be paid to their lay lords by ecclesiastical landholders, Latin and Greek alike, as in continental Greece. Since Alexius III Angelus was expelled in 1203, this means that the Latin Church in the Morea was to possess at least such lands and wealth as the Greek Church possessed when the Fourth Cru-

saders first appeared in the Morea, almost twenty years before.

As in the acts of Ravennika, the Greek clergy is not ungenerously protected by the pope. There are now established for each village, depending on its size, the numbers of Greek priests who may enjoy freedom from lay jurisdiction, which means also freedom from manorial and feudal service (*a laicali iurisdictione omnimodo liberi et immunes*): a village having from 25 to 70 homes (*lares*) may have two such priests; a village of from 70 to 125 homes, 4 priests; and those containing more than 125 may have 6 priests.¹⁷ Such priests shall, however, pay the old land tax or *akrostichon* if it is due from the lands they hold. Villehardouin and his Latin subjects are to pay tithes, and they are to see that the Greeks pay tithes also without their customary recourse to arms (*et facietis a Grecis vobis subditis et non rebellantibus simili modo persolvi*). Nevertheless, Villehardouin and his feudatories are to receive the treasures and movable property of the Moreote churches, provided they establish an annuity of one thousand hyperperi, to be divided among the archiepiscopal sees of Patras and Corinth, and the bishoprics of Lacedaemonia, Amyclae, Coron, Modon, Olena, and Argos. Lest this agreement between the rulers and the hierarchy in the Morea become a "labyrinth of confusion," his Holiness gives it the confirmation of his apostolic authority.¹⁸ For easy reference to the agreement made at Ravennika in 1210, the *resignatio Ravennice*, as it is regularly called, the acts of the clerico-feudal parliament are appended to the pope's letter to Geoffrey.¹⁹

An epistle similar to the one sent to Geoffrey was sent also to Othon de la Roche on the same

I, doc. 10, pp. 12–13); *Regesta*, I, no. 1819, p. 302. Cardinal Giovanni's letters of commission as papal legate in the Latin empire were drafted on 21–22 April, 1217 (Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 5527 [vol. I, p. 486]; *Regesti*, I, no. 496, p. 137, and cf. nos. 503, 546, *et alibi*; *Regesta*, I, no. 526, p. 92; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1217, nos. 8–9, vol. XX [Lucca, 1747], pp. 405–6).

¹⁶ Cf. Nikos A. Bees, "Bambacoratius, ein Beiname des Kaisers Alexius III Angelos," *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, III (1922), 285–86. (The reference here is not, as was formerly supposed, to the Emperor Alexius Murzuphlus.) On the name "Bambacoratius" (Βαμβακοράβδης), see R. J. Loenertz, "La Chronique brève de 1352 . . . : Première partie, de 1205 à 1327," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXIX (1963), 337–38.

¹⁷ "In casali vero XXV et ultra usque ad LXX lares habenti duo erunt papates cum uxoribus, filiis et familiis suis, etc. . . . Quod si ultra centenarium et vicesimum quintum excesserit, numerus papatum excrescet in sextum." Doc. cited in following note.

¹⁸ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 47 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 18, pp. 23–27; *PL* 216, 968–72); *Regesta Honorii papae III*, II (1895), no. 4480, p. 159; Potthast, no. 7077 (vol. I, p. 612), doc. dated 4 September, 1223. The pope actually assigns annuities of 1,150 hyperperi (not 1,000) to the eight churches in question, but the text as found in Lampros, *op. cit.*, p. 26, reproduces exactly the archival register (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 101^v).

¹⁹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 12, fols. 101^v–102^r; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pp. 27–30; *PL* 216, 970–72.

day (4 September, 1223). The same provisions governed the numbers of Greek priests to serve their people in the villages of Attica and Boeotia as were to obtain in the Morea. For the ecclesiastical treasure which he held, however, and for the movable property of the Church in his domain, Othon de la Roche was to establish an annuity of five hundred hyperperi for the clergy, to be divided as follows: 126 hyperperi to the cathedral Church in Athens; 100 to the Church of Thebes; 200 to the Church of Argos; and 74 to the Church of Daulia.²⁰ The terms of the agreement with de la Roche also received papal confirmation to avoid the same "labyrinth of confusion."²¹ At the same time de la Roche agreed to restore to the Latin Church in his Argolitan fief the estates which he had seized from it and the many years' revenues which had accrued therefrom.²²

From the number of documents drafted by the chancery clerks at Anagni in September, 1223, and concerned with affairs in the principality of Achaea and the lordship of Athens, it is apparent that Pope Honorius, though he might find relief at Anagni from the heat of Rome, found none from the anxiety under which he labored in the cause of Latin Christendom in Greece. On the nineteenth of the month he wrote Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Othon de la Roche of the relaxation of the interdict which had been imposed upon their lands, and assumed, in connection therewith, that Geoffrey and Othon stood ready with armed forces to act in defense of the threatened empire of Constantinople.²³ He reminded both

the prince of Achaea and the lord of Athens that the Holy See, like a pious mother, had tempered discipline with gentleness in dealing with them. Although their seizure of church property had been a grave offense against God, he now granted them indulgence, and excused them from the repayment of some of the ecclesiastical revenues they had improperly seized for their own use through the years of their estrangement from the Church.²⁴

The Church had finally reached at least some measure of accommodation with the Latin feudality in Greece. But the clergy always remained impoverished and dissatisfied with their condition. After all their heritage from the past was not a rich one. The Byzantine Church had itself shared in the general decline of the empire, and had hardly been enjoying prosperity at the time of the Fourth Crusade. Most members of the new Latin hierarchy and certainly the lesser *clerici cruce signati* probably gained as much by way of indulgences and the remission of sins as they did of worldly goods except when they could sell items from the ample stores of relics which they got with the conquest. Latin clerics received benefices, to be sure, which they might have lacked in the West, and younger sons and landless nobles acquired fiefs. The Fourth Crusade had some lucrative consequences, especially in the Morea during the early decades of the thirteenth century. But probably the Venetians scored the greatest gains. They established a commercial empire in the Levant, and in Venice they now began to build stately palaces along the Grand Canal.

When the Latin clergy in the Morea had refused to render military service for their fiefs, according to the *Chronicle of the Morea*, Geoffrey had expropriated their revenues with which he built the great castle of Chloumoutsis, called by the French Clermont and by the Italians Castel Tornese, for here the *tornesi*, based upon the coinage of Tours, were afterwards minted by his younger son. Geoffrey had summoned his wife from Champagne during the early period of his residence in the Morea, and she came with their young son Geoffrey II, who was to

²⁰ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, p. 30 (disregarding Lampros's inaccurate punctuation); cf. Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 12, fol. 103^r, and *Regesta Hon. III*, II, no. 4480, p. 159.

²¹ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, p. 31.

²² Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 25 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 12, pp. 18-19); *Regesta*, II, no. 4477, p. 158; doc. dated 3 September, 1223. The same struggle had gone on in Constantinople to secure restitution to the Church of some portion of the value of the Greek ecclesiastical property seized by the Frankish baronage and the Venetians after the conquest. The share to be given to the Church was first put at a fifteenth, later on at a twelfth, and finally (in 1219) it was set at an eleventh, which was apparently put into effect (see Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate . . .," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII, 267-74).

²³ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 43 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 15, pp. 21-22); *Regesta*, II, nos. 4503-4, p. 163; doc. dated 19 September, 1223. On the preceding day some of the charges, *plura loca*, were taken from the Church of Negroponte by the pope and bestowed upon the Church of Athens (*Regesta*, II, no. 4502).

²⁴ Hon. III, an. VIII, epp. 43, 46 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, docs. 16-17, pp. 22-23); *Regesta*, II, nos. 4503, 4507, pp. 163, 164; docs. dated 19 September, 1223.

succeed to the principality about 1228.²⁵ They took up their residence in the fine castles of La Crémone (Lacedaemonia) and Kalamata, in the latter of which was born Villehardouin's second son, William, who in 1246 became his brother Geoffrey's successor.

In the meantime the Latins had need of all the strength they could muster, for recent events had much encouraged the Greeks in their ambition to resist and repel the intruders in their midst. There had been no doubt for years that the purpose of the Epirote ruler Theodore Ducas's contest with the Latins in continental Greece was the acquisition of Thessalonica, and early in 1223 the dowager Queen Margaret returned to her home in Hungary until the issue should be decided. Her son Demetrius, the Latin king, had been in Italy for a year, seeking assistance, and Guido Palavicini, the margrave of Boudonitza, had left his castle at Thermopylae to take charge of the defense of Thessalonica. Theodore now began his long siege of the city, undeterred by Pope Honorius's many diplomatic measures to prevent him and spiritual messages to dissuade him. A crusade was preached, to which there was no response, but Honorius helped to gather a considerable force at Brindisi which the Marquis Guglielmo IV of Montferrat and his half-brother King Demetrius were to lead

into Greece to break Theodore's siege and maintain the last remnant of the Latin state their father had founded twenty years before.

A week after his coronation in 1217 the Latin Emperor Peter of Courtenay seems to have granted the Marquis Guglielmo almost everything in the kingdom of Thessalonica except the royal title.²⁶ It was clearly worth Guglielmo's time and trouble to venture into Greece, and the Curia Romana did what it could to make his expedition a success.²⁷ On 22 January, 1224, Pope Honorius extended his protection to Guglielmo and to "all the barons and knights of Lombardy, Tuscany, Burgundy, and other parts of the world, who are undertaking with him the journey into Romania."²⁸ A little more than two weeks later the pope sought to employ the high clergy of Italy and southern France as recruiting agents for the expedition to save those ancient lands which belonged to the marquis "by hereditary right" (Demetrius being forgotten), and the continued possession of which would be so useful to the empire of Constantinople and the *negotium Terrae Sanctae*.²⁹ On 20 May the pope wrote Blanche of

²⁵ Jean Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 158-59, and cf. *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 164, 166, has shown that the traditional dating of Geoffrey I's death in 1218 (after Buchon) is quite wrong, that it is in fact Geoffrey I who was engaged in the struggle with Pope Honorius III and the Latin Church in Greece from 1219 to 1223. The proof is this: Geoffrey I had two sons, Geoffrey II and William. Geoffrey II, commonly stated to have ruled from 1218 to 1246, had no children. On 1 April, 1222, however, Honorius III directed the archbishops of Thebes and Athens and the bishop of Negroponte to excommunicate "Geoffrey, prince of Achaia, his son Geoffrey, and his vassals" (*G. princeps Achaiae, G. natus et vassallius*), unless they obeyed the papal mandates already transmitted to them in other letters (Hon. III, an. VI, ep. 335, in Pressutti's *Regesta*, II, no. 3924, p. 62). When their differences had been resolved, on 16 September, 1223, the pope took under his protection the person of Prince Geoffrey, "with his wife, children, land and all his goods," *cum uxore, filiis, terra et omnibus suis bonis* (Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 42, in *Regesta*, II, no. 4501, p. 163). Many letters of Honorius III concerning ecclesiastical affairs in the East may be found in A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III* . . . (1950). This work is less complete, however, than Halušcynskyj's collection of the *acta* of Innocent III and does not contain, for example, these letters of 1 April, 1222, and 16 September, 1223.

²⁶ Honorius III, *Epp.*, an. I, no. 378, in *Regesti*, I, no. 477, p. 133; *Regesta*, I, no. 508, p. 89; C. A. Horoy, ed., *Honorii III opera omnia*, II (Paris, 1879), no. 298, col. 364; doc. dated 16 April, 1217. The Marquis Guglielmo received all the lands, revenues, and jurisdictions which his father Boniface had been granted by the Emperors Baldwin and Henry, which explains Guglielmo's interest in Greece. Demetrius was seeking aid in the west from the beginning of 1222. The Latin Archbishop Warin of Thessalonica was with him, as appears from an act of Frederick II Hofenstaufen, dated at Ferentino on 11 March, 1223, which was witnessed by both Demetrius and the archbishop (J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici secundi* . . . , vol. II, pt. 1 [Paris, 1852], p. 329, where Warin is misnamed Martin).

²⁷ The projected expedition of the Marquis Guglielmo IV of Montferrat was announced with high hopes by Honorius, who granted the *plena peccatorum venia* to some of his followers (Hon. III, an. VI, epp. 446-47, in *Regesta*, II, nos. 4059-60, p. 83, docs. dated 27 June, 1222, and no. 4353, p. 134, dated 13 May, 1223, and see Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, no. 7017 [vol. I, p. 607]). Theodore of Epirus, who had played at becoming a Catholic, was excommunicated, and the ban was published in Brindisi (Hon. III, an. VII, ep. 148, in *Regesta*, II, no. 4354, p. 134).

²⁸ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 247, in *Regesta*, II, no. 4704, p. 197.

²⁹ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 248, in *Regesta*, II, no. 4753, p. 205, dated 7 February, 1224. In March, 1224, Montferrat pledged all his possessions and revenues to the Emperor Frederick II for a loan of 9,000 marks of silver, "of the weight of Cologne," to help finance his expedition (Huillard-Bréholles, *Hist. dipl. Frid. II*, vol. II, pt. 1, pp. 425-26).

Castile, "illustrious queen of France," to try to persuade her husband King Louis VIII to send aid to the Latin Emperor Robert of Courtenay, son of the unfortunate Peter and cousin to the king, to help defend the empire of Romania, "which in the time of King Louis's own father [Philip Augustus] was won by Frenchmen in a glorious display of valor, and where there has been created, as it were, a new France" (*ibique quasi nova Francia est creata*).³⁰ The pope made every effort on behalf of the marquis of Montferrat, who seems by this time to have come to prefer a royal crown to "two oxen and a plow in Montferrat." Illness, however, delayed Guglielmo, and in November, 1224, he was still in Brindisi, but the pope assured the Latin clergy in the kingdom of Thessalonica that Guglielmo and his army were bound by oaths. He added that the expedition would set out in the coming March, and to help finance the undertaking an exaction was made of one-half the annual revenues and movable goods of the clergy in the kingdom.³¹

While the brothers of Montferrat were held back by repeated delays, Theodore Ducas pressed the siege of Thessalonica. Despite the urgent appeals of the pope, neither the Villehardouin of Achaea nor the de la Roche of Athens appear to have assisted the threatened city, which they probably could not reach since Theodore held most of Thessaly. Finally, toward the end of 1224, very likely in December, the despairing garrison in Thessalonica gave up after some twenty months' resistance to Theodore, who rode in triumph into the city.³² About a decade later, as we have already seen, a certain Sachlikina brought suit against her stepdaughter Horaia in a case, the record of which (preserved in a letter of Demetrius Chomatianus) helps to date Theodore's occupation of Thessalonica, and also provides an

interesting glimpse of the conduct of legal affairs in the city during the period of Latin domination.³³

To a greater extent than most men who have won political or military laurels, Theodore Ducas was the architect of his own fortune. He had built success upon success, but perhaps there is nothing in life so disenchanting as attainment. Each victory had produced another goal farther along the road. The conquest of Thessalonica carried with it irresistibly the necessity to march on toward Constantinople. In the meantime Theodore took the title of emperor, and gave that of despot to his brothers Constantine and Manuel. Although the Greek metropolitan of Thessalonica, Constantine Mesopotamites, refused to place the crown on Theodore's head, fearing thus to offend the Emperor John III Vatatzes of Nicaea and violate the rights of the Nicene "patriarch of Constantinople," the ambitious and independent Demetrius Chomatianus, autocephalous archbishop of Ochrida, performed the august ceremony in Thessalonica, possibly between June, 1227, and April, 1228,³⁴ and Theodore donned all the imperial trappings and distributed to other members of his family and his followers the honors and titles appropriate to his new position. Against the protests of Vatatzes and the Patriarch Germanus II in

³⁰ J. B. Pitra, ed., *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, VII [*sic*, actually vol. VI] (Paris and Rome, 1891), esp. cols. 450, 452, and 461, for the pertinent chronological data.

³¹ Cf. Lucien Stiernon, "Les Origines du despotat d'Épire," *Actes du XII^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, II (1964), 197–202. Theodore Ducas took the title "king and emperor of the Romans," βασιλεὺς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων (F. Miklosich and J. Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, V [Vienna, 1887]: *Acta insularum ionicarum*, no. 1, p. 15, doc. dated in June, 1228; K. Hopf, *Graziano Zorzi* [in Greek], trans. J. A. Romanos, Corfu, 1870, pp. 129 ff.). The historian George Acropolites, who had personal reasons for prejudice against the Ducae of Epirus, says that Theodore wore the red boots denoting imperial rank more like a Bulgarian or some other barbarian than a true Greek (*Chron.*, 21 [Bonn, pp. 36–37, and ed. Heisenberg, I, 34]). Cf. Demetrius Chomatianus, *Opera*, cap. CXIV, *Ep. ad Germanum CP.*, in Pitra, *Analecta sacra et classica* . . . , VII, cols. 488–90; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, II, 2 (Bonn, I, 25–26); and V. G. Vasilievskii, "Epirotica saeculi XIII," in *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, III (1896), 285–86. The background of events is sketched by A. D. Karpovskii, *The Ecclesiastical Controversy between the Kingdom of Nicaea and the Principality of Epiros (1217–1233)*, Thessaloniki, 1973, pp. 41–86, who would put Theodore's coronation in 1225–1226.

³⁰ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 442, in *Regesta*, II, no. 5006, pp. 250–51; Potthast, no. 7258 (vol. I, p. 626).

³¹ Hon. III, an. IX, ep. 83, in *Regesta*, II, no. 5186, p. 283; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 7321 (vol. I, p. 631); Horoy, *Honorii III opera omnia*, IV (Paris, 1880), no. 34, p. 721, doc. dated 28 November, 1224; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1224, nos. 24–26, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), pp. 536–37. For the reference to "two oxen and a plow in Montferrat," see above, Chapter 2, note 5.

³² Jean Longnon, "La Reprise de Salonique par les Grecs en 1224," *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, I (Paris, 1950), 141–46; B. Sinogowitz, "Zur Eroberung Thessalonikes im Herbst 1224," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLV (1952), 28; Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros* (1957), pp. 60–63.

Nicaea, who regarded this assertion of imperial dignity as an act of usurpation in arrogant defiance of the true sovereignty of the Nicene empire, Theodore's God-given right to the imperial title was defended by John Apocaurus, metropolitan of Naupactus from about 1200, Demetrius Chomatianus, archbishop of Ochrida from 1217, and George Bardanes "Atticus," metropolitan of Corfu from 1219. Byzantine political theory was offended by the thought of two emperors in the Greek world, and the increasing independence of the Epirote Church, firmly under the control of Theodore Ducas, rendered farcical the claims to jurisdiction enunciated from the patriarchal throne in Nicaea. Like the contemporary Asenids in Bulgaria, Nemanyids in Serbia, and Grand Comneni in Trebizond, Theodore Ducas insisted upon establishing an autonomous church in an autonomous state, the correspondence of civil and ecclesiastical boundaries having been almost axiomatic in the Orthodox world since the fourth century.³⁵ According to synodal letters prepared by both John Apocaurus and George Bardanes, Theodore was quite ready in 1227–1228 to acknowledge the authority of the Roman pontiff to secure recognition of his imperial title and of the independence of the Epirote Church.³⁶

The Epirote victories over the Latins of Thessalonica had been matched by those of the Nicene Emperor John III Vatatzes over the Latin Emperor Robert of Constantinople. When the first ruler of Nicaea, Theodore Lascaris, had died in 1222, he had designated his son-in-law Vatatzes as his successor. Theodore's two elder brothers, Alexius and Isaac, had first intrigued and then risen in arms against Vatatzes' accession, enlisting the aid of the Emperor Robert, who saw in them more friendly neighbors than Vatatzes would be. In 1224 at Poimanenon, however, Vatatzes defeated Robert and the Nicene insurgents; making the most of his success, he overran the country south of the Sea of Marmara; he captured a

number of Latin strongholds and crossed over to pillage the trading stations on Gallipoli. With both his eastern and western ramparts collapsing, Robert asked for peace, which Vatatzes granted in 1225 in a treaty by which the Latins retained nothing more of Asia Minor than the eastern shore of the Bosphorus and the territory around Nicomedia. Upon the invitation of the Greek inhabitants of Adrianople, Vatatzes sent an army to oust the Latins and occupy the city. Meanwhile the naval forces of Nicaea had been no less active than those on land; Vatatzes' fleet took over the islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Icaria, and Cos; and finally, in 1232–1233, he even established some sort of suzerainty over the island of Rhodes.³⁷

The Latin government in Constantinople had witnessed equal misfortunes on its European borders, which every month moved closer to the capital itself as Theodore Ducas continued without abatement his eastward advance from Serres, occupying town after town in eastern Macedonia and Thrace while the Latins withdrew before his irresistible drive. Theodore occupied Christoupolis (the modern Kavalla), Xanthia, Mosynopolis, Macri, and Demotica, until he reached Adrianople, from which he forced the withdrawal of the Nicene troops, thus adding another prize to his now extensive empire.³⁸ He ravaged the suburbs of Constantinople and surveyed the landward walls too strong for him to scale, at least on this occasion. In these days he seemed close to the realization of his great ambition. Only the walls

³⁵ Cf. Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros*, pp. 64–71, with the sources, and pp. 76–102; on George Bardanes, see the learned monograph of Johannes M. Hoeck and Raimund J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole . . .*, Ettal, 1965, pp. 117 ff., 148 ff., to which reference is made below.

³⁶ R. J. Loenertz, "Lettre de Georges Bardanes, métropolitain de Corcyre, au patriarche oecuménique Germain II," in *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, pp. 469, 471, 483–84, 501.

³⁷ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 22, 24, ed. Heisenberg, I, 34–36, 38; Nicephorus Gregoras, II, 1, 1–3 (Bonn, I, 24–25); Nicephorus Blemmydes, *Curriculum vitae et carmina*, ed. Aug. Heisenberg, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 61–63; Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 (1932), no. 1711, p. 8; Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 160–62; Hélène Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 315–17, 321–22. There were obviously grave limitations to Vatatzes' control over the island of Rhodes, however, as shown by the pact made in August, 1234, between Leo Gabalas, "lord of Rhodes and the Cyclades," and the Doge Jacopo Tiepolo of Venice, according to which Gabalas swore "quod vobis, domine mi Dux Venetorum, ero fidelis ab hodie usque imperpetuum" (Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II [1856], 319–22), and that he would assist the Venetian duke of Crete, when necessary, by providing "auxilium et iuvamentum contra Vatatium et contra suam gentem: et si intellexero Vatatium ire vel mittere supra Ducham Crete cum exercitu, dabo subsidium et auxilium eidem Duche Crete." Gabalas also promised to aid Venice to suppress any revolt on the part of the Cretans.

³⁸ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 24, ed. Heisenberg, I, 38–41.

he could see separated him from the famous churches and palaces in which he wished to live and locate his court. Very shortly, however, his dreams were interrupted by the news that the papal-Lombard expedition had landed in Thessaly, and he hastened back to Thessalonica to meet what seemed like the first serious challenge he had faced in a decade of conquest.

In the early spring of 1225 the Latin fleet had set sail, belatedly, carrying the men and horses with which the Marquis Guglielmo IV of Montferrat and Demetrius hoped to retake the city of Thessalonica. The fleet apparently rounded Cape Matapan, sailed the length of Negroponte, and reached Thessaly by way of the beautiful Gulf of Volos, where the army disembarked on the western shore, filling the plain of Halmyros. After the experience of Peter of Courtenay, Guglielmo and Demetrius had no desire to attack Theodore through the mountain passes of Albania. It would have been but a day's ride, without opposition, from Halmyros to Volos; another two or three, depending on the mobility of the baggage train, over the plain to Larissa, whence there was a route north through Elassona to Servia; and another, a better way, along the old military road to Tempe and Platamona. From here the way to Thessalonica lay along roads over which armies had constantly marched from the days of Philip of Macedon and Cassander. Theodore Ducas held all these places, however, and doubtless guarded the important roads, passes, and fords. The Latin army never reached Thessalonica, but came to grief in Thessaly where the Marquis Guglielmo died amid the customary reports of poison, probably a victim of the dysentery which afflicted his army. Rumor had it that the Greeks had polluted the water supplies. Demetrius returned to Italy where he died two years later at Pavia, leaving his title to the Latin Kingdom of Thessalonica to the Emperor Frederick II, who coveted also the title to Jerusalem.³⁹

The Monferratine cause had obviously not been advanced by the hostility of the native Greek population, which wanted the ruler of Thessalonica to be of their own race and language and religion. The house of Montferrat had no further chance of regaining its kingdom in Greece after the failure of Guglielmo's expe-

dition,⁴⁰ and the history of the royal title of Thessalonica, which was carefully preserved in one or another noble Italian or French family for another century, is the proper concern of the student of heraldry rather than of politics.⁴¹

Theodore Ducas was at the height of his career. Latin domination was maintained in Constantinople merely because its three chief enemies could not allow any one of themselves to take the city. Theodore Ducas and John Vatatzes watched each other, and they were both watched by John Asen II, the great tsar of Bulgaria (1218-1241), under whom the old realm of Krum, Simeon, and Ioannitsa experienced a new (and final) renaissance. After his occupation of Adrianople Theodore Ducas had signed a treaty with John Asen, for his conquests had given him a long border in common with Bulgaria.⁴² For whatever reasons

³⁹ According to the official historian of the house of Montferrat, Benvenuto Sangiorgio, himself count of Biandrate (d. 1527), Guglielmo IV died in 1225 allegedly of poison "in the city of Thessalonica," which he had succeeded in retaking. Sangiorgio's account is clearly inaccurate, for Guglielmo died in Thessaly, not Thessalonica. For the confusion, see Sangiorgio, *Hist. dei marchesi di Monferrato*, Italian version in Muratori, *RISS*, XXIII (Milan, 1733), 374D, 381DE-382A; "... il predetto Guglielmo l'anno MCCXXV nella città di Salonich soprapreso da veleno lasciò la vita;" Latin version in *Monumenta historiae patriae*, SS., III (Turin, 1848), 1322: "... una cum Demetrio fratre . . . in Graeciam est profectus: ac post immensos itineris susceptos labores, nec minus populorum rebellione fatigatus, ipsum tandem regnum consecutus est. Quod haud multo post Graeca fraude veneno petitus simul cum vita amisit . . . Demetrio . . . apud Thessalonica relicto . . ." (after which Demetrius was again driven from the Latin kingdom). However, Riccardo di S. Germano, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1225, in Muratori, *RISS*, VII (1725), 998E, and in *MGH*, SS., XIX (1866), 345, line 11, says that the marquis "in Romania naturali morte defunctus est," which in view of the papal testimony to his illness seems most likely. Cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 250, 257 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 184, 191), and Leopoldo Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (Turin, 1926), 275-77. Guglielmo IV of Montferrat was succeeded by his only son Boniface II (1225-1253), who had accompanied him on the ill-fated expedition.

⁴¹ Cf. Chas. Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon, 2 vols., Paris, 1826, I, *Recueil de chartes*, doc. XXII, pp. 454-55, which bestows *le Realm de Salenique* upon the noble baron Hugue duc de Borgoigne and upon his heirs forever (in 1266); and note also Buchon, *Recherches et matériaux pour servir à une histoire de la domination française*, I (Paris, 1840), p. 69, under *Eudes de Bourgogne*; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 84-85.

⁴² Acropolites, *Chron.*, 25, ed. Heisenberg, I, 41;

³⁹ Cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 163-64.

Theodore Ducas now appears to have spent a few peaceful years, concerning himself with the internal problems of his empire and doubtless planning a campaign against Constantinople. He was probably well informed about conditions in the Latin capital, and must have been reassured by what he learned, for ever since the death of the Emperor Henry one failure after another had produced an atmosphere of constant emergency and discouragement among the barons.

The Emperor Robert, indolent and licentious, had proved a terrible disappointment to his barons, who finally invaded his palace and inflicted grave indignities upon him in an effort to stir him into some activity, but Robert left Constantinople in furious resentment and went to Italy to lay his complaints at the feet of Pope Gregory IX, who comforted him and persuaded him to return to the capital.⁴³ On the way back he stopped off in the Morea, where his sister Agnes of Courtenay lived as the wife of the younger Geoffrey of Villehardouin. Here Robert died at the beginning of 1228.⁴⁴ Some months later Narjot of Toucy, the chief baron of the Latin empire, who bore the exalted title of caesar, became the bailie or regent of the empire. Narjot negotiated a

year's truce (1228–1229) with Theodore Ducas while a deputation was sent to Italy to wait on John of Brienne, one-time king of Jerusalem, who had distinguished himself in the disastrous Fifth Crusade which had taken and lost Damietta some years before. John was offered the position of co-emperor for his lifetime, and his little daughter Maria was to marry the young Baldwin II, who was to succeed to the sole rule of the empire only upon John's death. The arrangements were made at Perugia in April, 1229, in the presence of Pope Gregory IX, who promised John the necessary men and money to hold and extend the now constricted dominion of the Latin empire in Constantinople.⁴⁵

⁴³ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1229, nos. 46–48, vol. XXI (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), pp. 13–14. Gregory IX was certainly not lax in his efforts "ut . . . succurramus modis quibus possumus imperio Romano" (see J. Van den Gheyn, "Lettre de Grégoire IX concernant l'empire latin de Constantinople [Perugia, 13 December, 1229]," in *Revue de l'Orient latin*, IX [1902, repr. 1964], 230–34). The barons regent in Constantinople, under Narjot of Toucy, reached their accord (*treuga*) with Theodore Ducas in September, 1228. The Venetians also subscribed to the agreement, which was to last for a year, and provision was made for the entry of the prince of Achaea and the inhabitants of Monemvasia, *Greci de peloponnisso*, if they so wished. The Monemvasiotes recognized the suzerainty of the Ducae. The accord or truce of 1228 was designed especially to protect the merchants, Latin and Greek, who appear to have been engaged in no inconsiderable trade with one another despite the almost continuous state of war which had hitherto existed. The text may be found in Riccardo Predelli, ed., *Il Liber Communis detto anche Plegiorum: Regesti*, Venice, 1872, no. 691, pp. 162, 184–85, and Roberto Cessi, ed., *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*, I (Bologna, 1950), no. 140, pp. 209–10.

On imperial affairs at this juncture, note the projected pact between the barons regent and King John of Jerusalem for the marriage of his daughter and the young Baldwin II (Predelli, *Liber Communis*, no. 692, pp. 162–63, 185–86, and cf. Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II [1856], doc. CCLXXIII, pp. 265–70). When the Emperor Robert died, he left as his heir to the throne his brother Baldwin, then ten or eleven years old. John of Brienne had already given up his rights to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem to the Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen. John was crowned in Constantinople late in the year 1231 (cf. Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 292, and note the documents in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, nos. CCLXXVII–CCLXXX, pp. 277–99, and Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, an. III, ep. 5, in vol. I [1896], no. 290, cols. 175–76, et alibi). John probably died on 23 March, 1237, X. Kal. Apr. (Du Cange-Buchon, *Hist. de Constantinople*, I [1826], 233–34), after which Baldwin II ruled alone, being crowned in 1240 (Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 [1867], 255, and cf. pp. 252–53, 271 [repr. New York, 1960, I, 189, and cf. 187–88, 205]). For a brief sketch of the career of John of Brienne, see Louis Bréhier, "Jean de Brienne," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, X (1938), cols. 698–709, and cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 169–74.

Ephraem, *De Ioanne Duca Valatze*, 8038–64 (Bonn, pp. 324–25). Ephraem's chronicle, written in verse in the early fourteenth century, rehearses Acropolites for the period from 1204 to 1261: it has no independent value (K. Krumbacher, *Gesch. d. byzant. Litt.*, Munich, 1897, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 390–93, and G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., I [Berlin, 1958], 256–57), and will be rarely cited in the following pages. Cf. Nic. Gregoras, II, 2, 3 (Bonn, I, 27–28).

⁴⁴ Cf. in general Lucien Auvray, ed., *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, I (Paris, 1896), no. 47, col. 23, a bull of 7 April, 1227, granting the Emperor Robert the returns of an impost on rural Greek priests. From the beginning of his pontificate Gregory IX was attentive to the *negotium Terrae Sanctae* although his quarrel with Frederick II diverted his attention from the Crusade (cf., *ibid.*, I, nos. 1–2, 18–19, 24, 28–33, 125, 132, 136, 139, 152, 166, 178–79, 181, 188, 193, 249 ff.). The destruction of the Albigensian heresy by the armed might of *crucesignati* was a further distraction from Greek and Palestinian affairs. From about 1236 Gregory IX's hostility toward Frederick became almost the basis of papal policy (*ibid.*, II [1907], nos. 2482–83, 2778, 2986, 3181, 3362, 3565 ff., and III [1908], nos. 5092 ff., 5686, 6007 ff.), and yet it must be acknowledged that to the end of Gregory's reign the Curia Romana was conscientiously concerned with the affairs of Greece (cf., *ibid.*, III, nos. 4810–12, 4917–18, 5086, 5308, 5384, 6034–35, 6071, 6085).

⁴⁵ Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1 (1938–1948), 291, and cf. Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I (1906), 136–37, which is not entirely accurate.

In the meantime John Asen II, the tsar of Bulgaria, who was related by marriage to the family of the Courtenay, had offered himself to the baronage of Constantinople as imperial regent, proposing that Baldwin should marry his small daughter Helena, and promising that he would rewin for the empire all the lands in Thrace and Macedonia which Theodore Ducas had conquered, a clear violation of the alliance he had made with the latter about three years before. Although there was some sentiment in Constantinople to accept John Asen's offer, to most of the baronage this plan seemed like the surrender of the empire to the Bulgarians, enabling the tsar to achieve the ambition once entertained by Simeon three centuries before. The offer was declined, to the bitter disappointment of Asen, who became forthwith the enemy of the Latins in Constantinople.

The refusal of the barons to entrust the regency to John Asen must have been most gratifying to Theodore Ducas, who now saw his Bulgarian ally in a clearer light than hitherto as a competitor with himself for the city of Constantinople. A siege of the city would be very dangerous for Theodore since Asen could descend on the Epirotes at almost any time. No matter how great Asen's hostility to the Latins, he would hardly endure Theodore's occupation of Constantinople as the means of effecting their political demise. No, the army which Theodore had gathered for the assault on Constantinople must first free him from possible attack by the Bulgarians, for Asen's ambition must be moderated by defeat in time for Theodore to take Constantinople by siege before the arrival of John of Brienne with reinforcements.

John of Brienne had accepted the regency for Baldwin II, but had driven a rather hard bargain, having no intention of being deprived later on of the title of Constantinople by another imperial son-in-law after the fashion in which he had just lost the title of Jerusalem to Frederick II,⁴⁶ who had married John's

daughter Isabella (or Yolanda), heiress to the Latin kingdom in Palestine. As commander of the troops of S. Peter which Gregory IX had gathered to invade Apulia during Frederick's absence on the so-called Sixth Crusade, John was seeking revenge on the excommunicant crusader, who in the papal view had set about acquiring Jerusalem from al-Kāmil, the hard-pressed soldan of Egypt, more like a Levantine huckster than a Christian warrior.⁴⁷ On his return to Italy in the fall of 1229 Frederick had quickly defeated John of Brienne, who took refuge in France where with papal aid he spent the next year recruiting a sizable army which was to go with him on Venetian ships to Constantinople.

Some knowledge of John of Brienne's activities in France had doubtless reached Theodore Ducas in Thessalonica, but John had probably raised few troops when Theodore embarked on the ill-fated campaign which led to his downfall. Reaching the region of Adrianople in the early spring of 1230, he marched up the right bank of the Maritsa River on the way to Philippopolis, probably heading for the Bulgarian capital of Tirnovo in the northern foothills of the Balkan mountains. He was seeking his own destruction, says George Acropolites, and he found it when in April he met John Asen, who had barely a thousand men-at-arms with which to oppose him. Asen was incensed at this flagrant violation of the peace between them, and was said to have hung Theodore's sworn treaty to his standard (. . . ὡς φασί τινες κὰν τῇ σημαίᾳ τὸν ἐγγραφὸν ὄρκον τοῦ Θεοδώρου ἀπαιωρήσας), as though to remind the very heavens of the invader's perjury. The battle took place at Klokotnitza, by the modern village of Semidje, in the southern valley of the Maritsa some miles below Philippopolis. Theodore was defeated and captured. His career as an emperor was over. John Asen treated Theodore well at first, but when he discovered his captive intriguing against him, he had him blinded, and from this disability as from the defeat at Klokotnitza Theodore could never recover, although some seven years

⁴⁶ Cf. the agreement of April, 1229, negotiated with the assistance of Pope Gregory IX, whereby John of Brienne accepted the Latin crown of Constantinople (Tafel and Thomas, II, 267): ". . . propter debilem statum imperii dominus Rex Johannes habebit imperium et coronabitur in imperatorem et erit imperator ad totam vitam suam, et plenariam habebit potestatem et plenarium dominium, tanquam imperator, ad totam vitam suam . . ." (quoted in a letter of Gregory IX, *universis presentes literas inspecturis*, dated 9 April, 1229, and cf. Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I, nos. 290-91, cols. 175-76). It is of course well known that the Emperor Frederick II had been negotiating for some time with al-Malik al-Kāmil, the

soldan of Egypt, who ceded Jerusalem to the Christians in 1229 (cf. E. Blochet, "Les Relations diplomatiques des Hohenstaufen avec les sultans d'Égypte," *Revue historique*, LXXXI [1902], 51-64) and, later on, Frederick would deal with equal complacency with the Nicene Greeks.

⁴⁷ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I, no. 304, col. 186, letter of the Teutonic Grand Master Hermann of Salza to Gregory IX, dated March 1229, and cf., *ibid.*, I, nos. 306, 308-9, 317, 320-21, 324-25, 332, 350-51.

later he was to find his way back again to the political scene at Thessalonica.⁴⁸

The great events which had taken place in the north had left the Latin principality of Achaëa untouched except by anxiety. About 1228 or soon thereafter Prince Geoffrey I of Villehardouin died, much esteemed and lamented, and was succeeded by his distinguished son Geoffrey II. From his accession to the princely throne in the Morea, Geoffrey II was a powerful and respected person, who was to maintain at his court, according to the elder Marino Sanudo, eighty knights with golden spurs, and to enter whose service knights would come from France, Burgundy, and Champagne.⁴⁹ He began his reign during a very critical period in the Latin history of the Levant, for during his father's last years the Lombard expedition to recapture Thessalonica from Theodore Ducas, "true king and emperor of the Romans," had failed. If Thessalonica could not be recovered, could Constantinople be saved?

The capital city of the Latin empire became the source of increased concern in France, Italy, and Greece. The fall of the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica had interposed formidable enemies between Constantinople on the one hand and the lordship of Athens and the principality of Achaëa on the other, but the Bulgarian Tsar John Asen II's destruction of the power of Theodore Ducas at Klokotnitsa in April, 1230, had freed the rulers of both Athens and Achaëa from the dangers inherent in the great concentration of power in the hands of the Epirotes. The danger to the Latin empire, now largely confined to the shores of the Bosphorus, was in no way diminished, however, and the question was whether Constantinople would be taken by a Bulgarian or by a Nicene army, or whether John of Brienne, who was still in the west a year after the battle of Klokotnitsa, could defend the city when the final trial of arms should come. The danger from Bulgaria

seemed especially great for many months. John Asen had followed up his victory with the rapid conquest of most of Thrace and Macedonia. The empire of Theodore Ducas proved to be easily friable. Too quickly put together, the parts had never become welded, and Theodore's imperial glory became but an exciting memory. On a white column in his Church of the Forty Martyrs at Tirnovo, Asen commemorated his victory over Theodore and "all his boyars" in a famous inscription which declares his conquest of all the territory between Adrianople and Durazzo and avows that the Latins held Constantinople merely by his sufferance.⁵⁰

In the autumn of 1231 John of Brienne, elected Latin emperor of Constantinople for his lifetime and regent until Baldwin should attain his majority, at long last reached the shores of the Bosphorus. From about this time Prince Geoffrey II of Achaëa is said by an almost contemporary source to have sent John 22,000 hyperperi each year with which to hire auxiliary troops to defend the capital.⁵¹ Since John of Brienne had looked to the Venetians for the transport of troops and supplies to the East, the Genoese promptly sent two envoys (in 1231) "to Romania in a well-armed galley to discuss and to confirm a peace and alliance

⁴⁸ A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, Wisc., 1952, pp. 524-25. The inscription is reproduced by Th. I. Uspenskii in the *Izv. russk. Arkh. Instit. v Kpale*. [the *Izvestiia* of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople], VII (Odessa, 1901), plate 5.

⁵¹ Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1236, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII, 939: "... et ex quo rex Iohannes venerat ad partes illas [i.e. Constantinopolim], mittebat [iste Gaufridus] quolibet anno 22,000 perpres ad conducendos auxilarios." In April and May, 1231, John confirmed the partition treaty of 1204 and all the later *pacta et conventiones* made between the Latin emperors and the doges of Venice (Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, 277, 281-99). He sailed for Constantinople aboard a Venetian fleet on 1 August (Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 292, and cf. Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I, no. 656, col. 418). A papal letter of 10 October, 1231, attests the dangers one met in continental Greece and the Morea at this time (Auvray, I, no. 729, col. 452). Apparently the rule of Geoffrey in the Morea and of Guy de la Roche in Boeotia and Attica had not removed the hazards of travel (*viarum pericula*); nevertheless, the Franciscans were now arriving in some numbers (Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 137 ff.). At the Chapter General of Pisa in 1263 the province of Romania or Greece was detached from that of the Holy Land and given an autonomous status (see Golubovich, *op. cit.*, II [1913], 221, 232-33, 241-42, 261, 265, 271, 398-99, 402-3).

⁴⁹ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 25-26, ed. Heisenberg, I, 41-43 (quotation on p. 42, ll. 7-8); cf. Ephraem, vv. 8065-8110 (Bonn, pp. 325-26); Nic. Gregoras, II, 3, 1 (Bonn, I, 28); Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1230, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII (1874), 927; ad ann. 1233, *ibid.*, p. 933; and ad ann. 1236, *ibid.*, p. 938.

⁵⁰ Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 101. The last papal letter addressed to Geoffrey II is dated 6 May, 1246 (Élie Berger, ed., *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, I [Paris, 1884], no. 1842, p. 275, "nobili viro G[aufrido] principi Achaiae").

with Vatatzes, emperor of Romania. . . .⁵² As often, developments in the East determined policy in the West. Impoverished himself, John found conditions in Constantinople most discouraging. In 1234, for example, a papal embassy to Vatatzes and the Nicene patriarch observed that the Latin capital was in desperate straits, the Emperor John without funds, the mercenaries gone, and the Venetian, Pisan, Anconitan, and other ships preparing to withdraw. The alleged empire was desolate, "because that land is situated in the very midst of enemies."⁵³

Although the turbulent Theodore Ducas (1215–1230) had been eliminated, the Latins in Constantinople still had two determined enemies, the Bulgarian Tsar John Asen II and the Nicene Emperor John III Vatatzes, who came together in an alliance toward the end of the year 1234.⁵⁴ In the following months Vatatzes drove the Venetians from Gallipoli in a cruel campaign, swept across the Chersonese, and conquered everything of impor-

tance to the river Maritsa, including the strong fortress of Tzurulum (Chorlu), in southeastern Thrace. Hopes of a *reconquista* must have run high in Nicaea. John Asen plundered the north country.⁵⁵ Although small victories were won by John of Brienne on land and by the Venetians on the sea, Geoffrey II of Villehardouin emerged in 1236 as the chief defender of the Latin empire. Geoffrey hastened to Constantinople with ships and troops; penetrated a Byzantine naval cordon; entered the city; and destroyed fifteen of the three hundred vessels the Greeks are said to have had.⁵⁶ An ominous threat to the capital thus came to an end, and therewith for some time to come the Nicene hope of re-establishing the Greek empire in the city of Constantine. But the Latin empire needed the continued support of the Villehardouin.

⁵² L. T. Belgrano and Cesare Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori* [1099–1293–4], 5 vols., Genoa and Rome, 1890–1929 (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, nos. 11–14), III (1923), 57. (Since Caffaro wrote in the first half of the twelfth century, the references in the present work to the *Annali genovesi* are obviously to parts composed by his continuators, on whom see the prefaces written by Imperiale.)

⁵³ See the so-called *Acta concilii primo apud Nicaeam, tum apud Nymphaeam, habiti*, in J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XXIII (Venice, 1779), 292E–293A; Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 165; and a new edition of the text by Golubovich, "Disputatio latinorum et graecorum [1234]," etc., in *Archivum franciscanum historicum*, XII (Quaracchi, 1919), 446: "Preterea terra Constantinopolis quasi destituta fuit omni presidio: dominus Imperator Ioannes pauper erat. Milites stipendiarii omnes recesserunt. Naves Venetorum, Pisanorum, Anconitanorum, et aliarum nationum parate fuerunt ad recedendum, et quedam vero iam recesserant. Considerantes igitur terram desolatam, timuimus periculum, quia in medio inimicorum terra illa sita est." On the Graeco-Latin theological *pourparlers* of 1234, see esp. M. Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs et l'église grecque orthodoxe au XIII^e siècle (1231–1274)*, Cairo, 1954, pp. 43–84. On John of Brienne, note also Golubovich, I, 178–80, and II, 122–24, and J. M. Buckley, "The Problematical Octogenarianism of John of Brienne," *Speculum*, XXXII (1957), 315–22.

⁵⁴ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 31, 33, ed. Heisenberg, I, 48–49, 50–51. A marriage was arranged between Vatatzes' eleven-year-old son Theodore Lascaris and Asen's nine-year-old daughter Helena. On the background and chronology, see Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3 (1932), nos. 1730, 1745–47; cf. Geo. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 388–89, and Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto* (1965), pp. 167–68.

⁵⁵ Cf. Acropolites, *Chron.*, loc. cit.; Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), nos. 2872–79, cols. 217–18, docs. dated 16 December, 1235; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 253–54 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 187–88); Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 167–73.

⁵⁶ Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1236, in *MGH, SS.*, XXIII, 938–39. Although Aubrey says that Geoffrey II had 120 ships (*naves*), according to Robert Saulger (1637–1709) he had only six of his own. Saulger is a generally good source despite his late date because of his access to Naxiote letters and documents no longer extant: "Geofroy de Villehardouin vint lui-même en personne avec six gros vaisseaux; les Vénitiens en envoièrent seize . . . le Duc de Naxe en arma quatre . . ." (in his anonymously published *Histoire nouvelle des anciens ducs et autres souverains de l'Archipel*, Paris, 1698, p. 44). Saulger also makes Angelo Sanudo, second duke of Naxos (the Archipelago), share with Villehardouin the naval honors against the Greeks. Cf. Buchon, *Recherches et matériaux*, I (1840), 152, 154, and esp. Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II, nos. 3382, 3408–9, cols. 506, 521–23, docs. dated 22 November and 23 December, 1236, informing the Latin hierarchy in Greece that a tithe was to be imposed and used for the defense of the Latin empire as should seem best to Villehardouin, who had been incurring great expense "pro succursu et defensione imperii Constantinopolitani." (Auvray incorrectly identifies G. princeps Achaie as Guillelmus.) A Venetian document of 13 April, 1227, refers to proceedings against one Niccolò Calbani, who had sold Geoffrey I of Villehardouin a galley *contra honorem Venecie* (R. Predelli, ed., *Il Liber Communis detto anche Plegiorum: Regesti* [1872], no. 525, p. 128), which may help to explain where Villehardouin got at least one of his ships. On his aid to Constantinople, cf. Philippe Mouskes, *Chronique rimée*, ed. [F.A.F. Th.] de Reiffenberg, Brussels, 1836–38, II, vv. 29, 238–59, pp. 620–21. On 18 January, 1238, the Latin clergy in Greece were assessed a third of their movable goods and incomes to help finance the defense of Constantinople (Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II, nos. 4035–36, cols. 858–60, and cf. no. 4711).

In the meantime, having escaped from the disaster at Klokotnitsa, Manuel Ducas, the defeated Theodore's brother, had returned to Thessalonica where he employed to full advantage the title of despot which Theodore had given him some time before. Seizing control of the city and the region to the southwest of it, Manuel assumed imperial airs, signing his documents in cinnabar ink (*ἐρυθροῖς γράμμασι*), which earned him the raillery of a Nicene envoy who said that the liturgical description of Christ as "king and lord" (*βασιλεὺς καὶ δεσπότης*) were better applied to Manuel. Asen left him his pretensions in Thessalonica and did not dispute his assertion of authority over Epirus, for Manuel had married Asen's daughter Maria.⁵⁷

Insecure in his unexpected sovereignty, Manuel Ducas now made overtures to Pope Gregory IX, and expressed his willingness humbly to recognize the maternal authority of the Roman Church in return for papal protection of his lands, presumably against Prince Geoffrey II of Achaea and Michael II Ducas, son of the late Michael of Epirus, who was anxious to recover his paternal inheritance. The young Michael seems to have acknowledged the Achaean suzerainty.⁵⁸ Pope Gregory gave Manuel a rather uncertain answer (in a letter dated at Rieti on 1 April, 1232), informing him that the Curia would seek the guidance of the Latin Emperor John and the Latin Patriarch Simon in Constantinople.⁵⁹ But the papal response could have made little difference to Manuel, for he had already turned his gaze toward the Nicene light in the east, and was prepared to abandon his imperial pretensions and make his peace with the Emperor John Vatatzes and the Greek Patriarch Germanus

II,⁶⁰ after which relations between Nicaea and Thessalonica remained fairly amicable.

About three years later, however, Manuel appears to have become ready to turn once more to Gregory IX, for he feared that the forces of Frederick II might occupy the important island of Corfu, his westernmost possession. At any rate he now sent the learned Athenian George Bardanes, the metropolitan of Corfu, on a mission to Gregory as well as to Frederick. Manuel was probably willing again to acknowledge himself a dutiful son of the Latin Church if Gregory would keep Frederick out of Corfu. Bardanes' ship set sail from the island for Brindisi, but was driven from its course by adverse winds, and on 15 October, 1235, landed at Otranto, where the good metropolitan fell sick. Bardanes had been in poor health for some time. He spent a month at the nearby Basilian monastery of Casole, whose late abbot Nectarius (also known as Niccolò of Otranto) had long served the papacy and preserved his Greek Orthodoxy too. When his illness continued, Bardanes was removed to Otranto (on 17 November), where he remained for six months, living in the house of John Grasso "Idruntinus," a fiery Ghibelline, a poet and bilingual notary of Frederick II, just the man to brief Bardanes on the best way to approach the emperor and the officials of his chancery, but likely to give him a prejudiced view of the Curia Romana if Bardanes required any more prejudice than he already had. It is not clear, however, how much time if any John Grasso spent with Bardanes at Otranto, and indeed it is not really clear why Manuel Ducas sent Bardanes to Italy. But when the latter was finally able to resume his mission and was preparing to travel to both the imperial and papal courts, Manuel recalled him,⁶¹ possibly because

⁵⁷ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 26, ed. Heisenberg, I, 43–44, on which cf. Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, p. 151, and Polemis, *The Doukai* (1968), p. 90.

⁵⁸ Cf. Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 168–69, 170, and on Michael II, note Polemis, *The Doukai*, pp. 93–94.

⁵⁹ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I, no. 786, cols. 491–93, on which see Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 154–55. In 1232 the Patriarch Germanus II of Nicaea was also in correspondence with Pope Gregory IX concerning the possibility of church union (Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I, nos. 803–4, cols. 502–3, with refs., and cf., nos. 849, 1316). Cf. Golubovich, *Bibl. bibliogr.*, I (1906), 161–62, 168, and vol. II (1913), 510–12, and Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs . . .* (1954), pp. 31–42.

⁶⁰ Cf. Hoeck and Loenertz, *op. cit.*, pp. 156–58, and doc. no. 10, *ibid.*, pp. 190–93, a letter of George Bardanes, metropolitan of Corfu (Corcyra), to the Patriarch Germanus II, apparently written in the early summer of 1232.

⁶¹ All the older accounts of Bardanes' Italian mission are wrong. The chronology was first established by Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 117–25, 148 ff., and esp. pp. 164–68. Cf. the confusion in Cardinal Baronius [Cesare Baronio], *Annales ecclesiastici*, ad ann. 1176 [1], nos. 23–29, and note, *ibid.*, the years following to 1188, vol. XII (Antwerp: Plantin, 1629), 667–69 and ff., with Latin translations of eleven letters of Bardanes (which after the year 1176 Baronius assigns [in the Plantin edition] ad ann. 1178, nos. 16–19; 1179, nos. 13–16; 1180, nos. 34–42; and 1188, nos. 36–38), on the inter-

he had decided that the Roman pontiff could serve him less well in Corfu than the Nicene patriarch could in Thessalonica. Actually recognition of papal supremacy would have been inconceivable, and would have imperiled Manuel's none too steady position in Greece, especially as John Asen, aggrieved at the Latin baronage in Constantinople, had broken off the union of the Bulgarian Church with Rome, which had endured with more or less continuity for almost thirty years, ever since the days of Innocent III and the Tsar Ioannitsa. Besides, the march of events was probably beginning to make it clear to Manuel that Gregory IX could not assure him continued possession of Corfu against a decision of Frederick to take the island, for the latter's reconciliation with the papacy at San Germano had worn thin, and papal influence would hardly be adequate to restrain Hohenstaufen ambition on the Adriatic where Manuel's brother-in-law, Count Matteo Orsini of Cephalonia, had for years acknowledged his vassalage to Frederick.

The decisive battle of Klokotnitsa not only ruined Theodore Ducas and elevated his brother Manuel to power in Thessalonica, but it soon

resulted, for whatever reason, in the third brother Constantine's finding it necessary to relinquish his authority over Aetolia and Acarnania, apparently to join Manuel in Thessalonica either to serve him in the capital or to be under his surveillance. The new state of affairs also gave young Michael [II] Ducas, exiled son of Michael I, the opportunity to return, very likely from the Morea, to his home in Arta to rule with the title of despot over Epirus as his uncle Manuel's alleged lieutenant. Michael II now began a notable career of almost forty years' rule in Epirus, making him one of the most conspicuous figures in the thirteenth-century history of Greece. Of his early life little or nothing is known beyond the (later) tradition that he caused his pious wife Theodora Petraliphas (Petaliphina), the "blessed Theodora of Arta," terrible hardships during the first five years or so of their marriage, banishing her from his life and court while he lived with his mistress Gangrené (1230–1235).⁶² During this period Michael had two sons by Gangrené, of whom the elder, the able John Ducas, was to receive Thessaly from his father and bequeath to his heirs the great castle on the craggy height of Neopatras (the modern Hypate).

Far from the dangerous rivalry of Bulgaria and Nicaea, the "despotate" of Epirus prospered

pretation of which see the article of Ed. Kurtz, "Georgios Bardanes, Metropolit von Kerkyra," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XV (1906), 603–13. In the present context, observe the fourth letter, dated by Baronius 1178 [1], which Kurtz, *op. cit.*, has erroneously assigned to the fall of 1231; this letter, which appears in the edition of Hoeck and Loenertz as no. 15, pp. 203–4, was written toward the end of the year 1235. Baronius has of course confused Manuel Ducas (1230–1237) with the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143–1180), and Frederick II (1212–1250) with Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–1190). See also Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 170 ff.; Martiniano Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs . . .*, pp. 23–25; and K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), 14–15, 32–33. On the historical background, note also Silvano Borsari, "Federico II e l'Oriente bizantino," *Rivista storica italiana*, LXIII (Naples, 1951), 279–83, with refs., but all these studies, like everything else which has appeared on this subject before the monograph by Hoeck and Loenertz, must be used with caution.

George Bardanes has left a half dozen letters relating to his fruitless mission to Italy in 1235–1236 (Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, nos. 15–20, pp. 203–18), in which he describes the hardships of his journey and near-shipwreck (*ibid.*, pp. 204, 214), his intention of going to the Curia Romana (pp. 204, 206, 215), and Manuel Ducas's sudden orders to him to return to Corfu and await further instructions (p. 215). It would have been difficult to see the Emperor Frederick II, who was then in Germany, but Frederick appeared unwilling to abandon his claims to Corfu (pp. 217–18).

⁶² Job Monachus [who wrote in the thirteenth century], ed. J. A. C. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II (Paris, 1845): *Corfou*, doc. II, pp. 401–6, and J. P. Migne, *PG* 127, cols. 904–8; *Chronicle of Galaxidi* (in Greek), ed. C. N. Sathas, Athens, 1865, repr. 1914, pp. 197–200, and ed. G. Valetas, Athens, 1944, pp. 110–14; and cf. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 97; Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros* (1957), pp. 128–31. Theodora Petraliphas was a member of an important, completely Hellenized family of Norman-Italian origin (cf. Nicetas Choniates, *De Manuele Comneno*, II, 4 [Bonn, pp. 110–11]), descended from one Pietro d'Alifa or Pierre d'Aulps, whose members had served Byzantium faithfully for well over a century before the Fourth Crusade. Theodora bore Michael II three sons, of whom the eldest, Nicephorus, was born after their estrangement began. It was Nicephorus who inherited the despotate of Epirus after Michael's death, which B. Ferjančić has recently established as occurring between September, 1266, and August, 1268, not as formerly assumed in 1271 (cf. the notice of his article in the *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta*, IX [1966], 29–32, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LIX [1966], 436). Theodora's handsome sister Maria Petraliphas was of less than "blessed" character, and connived at the murder of her husband, the aging Philippe Chinard, lord of Corfu (cf. E. Bertaux, "Les Français d'outre-mer en Apulie et en Épire . . .," *Revue historique*, LXXXV [1904], 244).

under Michael II, who ruled with ever larger independence of his helpless uncle Manuel in Thessalonica. Circumstances gave a wide scope to his talent, and experience made him aware of abundant opportunity and increased his sense of responsibility. He put away his mistress, and restored Theodora to his side. She served him well as wife and counsellor, even going in later years to Pegae in Asia Minor to arrange the betrothal of their son Nicephorus to a granddaughter of John Vatatzes (in 1249).⁶³ By 1236 Michael had acquired Corfu, possibly with Manuel's compliance, and won the allegiance of the Corfiotes by the generous confirmation of all their past privileges. He encouraged the merchants of Ragusa to trade in the despotate, making the most earnest undertaking to protect their persons and their property.⁶⁴

During the years that Manuel Ducas, amiable and unforceful, lived out his reign in Thessalonica, and Michael II was slowly but surely rebuilding the strength of Epirus, Theodore languished in his Bulgarian captivity. But Theodore's hopes of release and a return to the Greek world were quickened when John Asen, whose wife had died, fell in love with his beautiful daughter Irene, who shared her blind father's confinement among the barbarians. John Asen married her in 1237, and freed Theodore, who promptly made plans with Asen's consent to retrieve what he could of his former power. He hastened to Thessalonica, entered the city stealthily, and found supporters enough to seize the throne from Manuel, who was put on board a ship and sent to Adalia on the southern coast of Asia Minor. Theodore was unwilling to resume the imperial title because of his blindness, but he had his son John named emperor, and prepared to rule from behind the throne. John Asen was satisfied with the arrangement and made no protest,

"for he loved his wife Irene," says Acropolites, "no less than Antony had loved Cleopatra."

Upon his arrival in Adalia Manuel was well received by the Moslems, who helped him to go on to the court of John Vatatzes where he was welcomed as a kinsman and a despot. Vatatzes still nurtured unpleasant memories of the aggressive Theodore, and gave Manuel money and six triremes with which to return to Thessaly, first exacting the most solemn oath of loyalty from him (*ὅρκους παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβὼν φρικώδεις*). Manuel set sail for Demetrias on the Gulf of Volos, whence he sent letters to his friends and supporters to notify them of his reappearance in Greece. This was in 1239. He raised a considerable army, and took the important strongholds of Pharsala, Larissa, and Platamona. It was a good beginning, but Manuel was a schemer rather than a warrior, and he was soon negotiating with his brothers Theodore and Constantine. When they met, the two brothers persuaded Manuel to disregard his oath of allegiance to Vatatzes, as witnesses later attested, and Manuel did so, however reluctant he may have been. The three Ducae now effected an amicable division of the lands and towns in dispute, and made alliances with the Latin triarchs of Negroponte and Prince Geoffrey II of Achaea.⁶⁵ When Manuel died in 1241, Michael II annexed his holdings in Thessaly to the despotate of Epirus. John Asen died in June of the same year, and the strength of Bulgaria departed with him.⁶⁶ Considering the divisions among the western Greeks, and the pitiful condition of the Latin empire under the young Baldwin II, John Vatatzes now towered above his former rivals and opponents, whose reverses always encouraged his own ambition.

At this point, however, a new tide of turmoil swept in upon the Balkans and the Levant. In 1241 the Mongols burst into central Europe, defeating the Poles and Hungarians in April. It was an appalling onslaught, and in letters of 16 June, 1241, Pope Gregory IX tried to get the clergy and laity of Europe to meet the inva-

⁶³ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 49, ed. Heisenberg, I, 88–89, and cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1799, p. 21. Owing to war between Nicaea and Epirus, the marriage did not take place until the autumn of 1256 (Acropolites, 63, 64, *ibid.*, I, 132–33, 134), on which see below, p. 73b, where it may be observed Theodora made another long journey with her son to bring it about, unfortunately succeeding the second time.

⁶⁴ Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 170–71; Paul Lemerle, "Trois Actes du despote d'Épire Michel II concernant Corfou," *Ἑλληνικά*, IV, Suppl. (Thessaloniki, 1953), pp. 414–18.

⁶⁵ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 38, ed. Heisenberg, I, 60–62; Ephraem, vv. 8325–69 (Bonn, pp. 335–36), and cf. Hoeck and Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 169–70.

⁶⁶ The death of John Asen "circa festum sancti Iohannis" (24 June) is one of the last facts recorded in the chronicle attributed to Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, who notes that the Latin government in Constantinople made a two years' truce with Asen's successor Koloman and also with Vatatzes (*Chron.*, ad ann. 1241, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII, 950).

sion with a crusade, *assumpto crucis signaculo*, and was prepared to grant anti-Tatar crusaders the same immunity and indulgence as the defenders of the Holy Land were receiving.⁶⁷ But the Mongols left Europe upon the death of the great khan Ögödei, for their commander Batu was to take part in the election of a new khan at Karakorum. Some of Batu's forces withdrew by way of Transylvania and Moldavia, others through the lands of the South Slavs, striking terror into the hearts of the Bosnians, Serbs, and Bulgarians, from whom they took plunder and exacted tribute. The Mongols had already overrun southern Russia (Batu left his forces in the steppes of the Don as he hurried eastward), and here they established in the lower valleys of the Don and the Volga the khanate of the Golden Horde, which was to endure for more than two hundred years.⁶⁸ The general consternation seemed to offer Vatatzes an opportunity, and in 1242 he led an army, supported by a fleet, into Macedonia, and marched upon Thessalonica although he lacked siege machinery. He immediately found himself in an awkward position when word reached him of the Mongol invasion of

Anatolia and attacks upon the sultanate of Iconium (Konya) and the Greek empire of Trebizond, both of which were quickly reduced to the status of tribute-paying satellites.

If Vatatzes now had to conclude his assault upon Thessalonica after some six weeks, he was still able to force John Ducas, who was more of a monk than a soldier, to abandon the insignia of empire and recognize by oath the sovereignty of Nicaea, contenting himself with the title of despot.⁶⁹ Now there was one Greek emperor, and Vatatzes could face his western problems with every confidence. He went back home with his forces, spending the winter of 1242–1243 at Nymphaeum, and soon formed a defensive alliance with the sultan of Iconium.⁷⁰ Here again, as in the west, the misfortunes of his enemies increased Vatatzes' power and prosperity, which were always relative to circumstance, for while the Mongol invasion caused havoc in Iconium, it never reached the Nicene empire. The Turks, lacking food and materials, purchased them at high prices in gold from the Nicene Greeks. Vatatzes' long career was always marked by the interplay of prudence and good fortune.

Vatatzes' hold upon the despotate—no longer empire—of Thessalonica was rather tenuous, but when John Ducas died in 1244, and blind Theodore wanted his younger son Demetrius to secure the succession, the Ducae felt it wise to request Vatatzes' confirmation of Demetrius as the new despot. Vatatzes granted their request;⁷¹ nevertheless, the independent state of Thessalonica had almost run its course. Acropolites contrasts the chastity and religious devotion of John with the riotous and libidinous life of his brother Demetrius. On one occasion, "desiring to escape by the window, upon the sudden entry of his mistress's husband, Demetrius fell from a great height and struck his buttocks, and after being laid up for some time, he became healed, but limped a little in one foot and did not walk straight."⁷² Demetrius doubtless assessed his

⁶⁷ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, fasc. 12 (Paris, 1910), nos. 6057–62, cols. 523–24, and cf. Jean Richard, "The Mongols and the Franks," *Journal of Asian History*, III (Wiesbaden, 1969), esp. pp. 45–52.

⁶⁸ Cf. in general Georges Rochcau, "Innocent IV devant le péril tatar: Ses lettres à Daniel de Galicie et à Alexandre Nevsky," *Istina*, VI (Boulogne-sur-Seine, 1959), 167–86, and on Innocent IV's missions to the Mongols, note also G. G. Guzman, "Simon of Saint-Quentin and the Dominican Mission to the Mongol Baiju: A Reappraisal," *Speculum*, XLVI (1971), 232–49. Of the sources now available in English relating to the thirteenth-century Mongols (especially in the Middle East), particular attention should be paid to Juvaini, *The History of the World-Conqueror*, trans. John Andrew Boyle, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1958, and note Jean Richard, *Simon de Saint-Quentin, Histoire des Tartares* [partially retrieved from the text of Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, bks. XXX–XXXII], Paris, 1965, *passim*, with refs. and notes, and esp. pp. 76 ff., on the Mongol invasions of Trebizond, Iconium, Hungary, and Poland in the early 1240's. On the long-range effects of the Mongol invasions, see Bernard Lewis, "The Mongols, the Turks, and the Muslim Polity," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., XVIII (1968), 49–68.

It may not be amiss to observe at this point that in 1238 the Latin Emperor Baldwin II, then in Paris seeking funds for the defense of Constantinople, agreed to sell Louis IX the crown of thorns, which arrived in Paris in August, 1239 (P. Pelliot, "Les Mongols et la papauté," *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 3rd ser., VIII [XXVIII, 1931–32], 4–6). Such a relic naturally excited much interest (Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1239, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII, 947; Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, II [1913], 306–11).

⁶⁹ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 40–41, ed. Heisenberg, I, 65–68, and cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1775, p. 19.

⁷⁰ Acropolites, 41, ed. Heisenberg, I, 69, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1776, p. 19, with refs.

⁷¹ Acropolites, 42, 45, ed. Heisenberg, I, 70, 79, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1778, p. 19.

⁷² Acropolites, 42, ed. Heisenberg, I, 71. (The Latin translation in the Bonn Corpus, p. 76, seems erroneous to me: it was Demetrius who left by the window, not the unexpected husband who entered thereby!)

experience after the fashion of the Italian proverb that it is better to fall from windows than from the roof—*è meglio cader dalle finestre che dal tetto*—and continued his pursuit of pleasure, which was however to prove of short duration.

In 1246 John Vatatzes made a casual expedition into Thrace with the intention of visiting his European possessions. Almost untouched by the Mongol incursions into Anatolia (1242), his eastern borders protected by alliance with the sultan of Iconium ('43), and now bound by ties of marriage with the western Emperor Frederick II ('44), Vatatzes could turn his attention to the Greek mainland with assurance of tranquillity at home. While in Thrace, Vatatzes learned at the beginning of September that the young tsar of Bulgaria, Koloman (1241–1246), had died, some claiming he had been poisoned, and with some hesitation Vatatzes decided to respond to what looked like a fine opportunity for the acquisition of towns and territory although he had few troops with him. A memorable season of conquest began with his brief but successful siege of the important fortress of Serres.⁷³

Vatatzes was now quick to perceive the high tide in his efforts and decided to sail with the current. He ventured north to take Melnik, and continued northeastward to capture Stenimachus, Tzepaena, and other places in the

upper valley of the Maritsa, which became the boundary between Bulgaria and the Nicene empire, all without a struggle, "as though he were taking over an inheritance from his father." He pushed on into the far northwest, taking Velbuzd (Küstendil) on the upper Strymon; moved south taking Skoplje and Stip in the Vardar region; then through Veles, Prilep, and Pelagonia in the plains of Monastir; and eastward again to the Vardar where he took Prosek. It was a triumphant progress from beginning to end, but the end was not yet. In less than three months Vatatzes had overrun all southwestern Bulgaria, "and this is the way things turned out," says Acropolites, "and I myself helped in writing the reports as well as in preparing an imperial letter for each one of the captured cities and towns: it is the ancient custom of the Roman emperors to make known by writing the successes they have achieved to enable those at a distance also to share in the pleasure of their deeds."⁷⁴

In mid-November, 1246, Vatatzes was encamped with his army at Melnik, planning to return home for the winter, when a final wave of good fortune led him to embark on his greatest conquest. In Thessalonica the irresponsible conduct of Demetrius had led to the formation of an opposition party which was conspiring to oust him and turn the city over to Vatatzes. One of the conspirators named Campanus went to see Vatatzes, offering him the city in return for confirmation of the ancient rights, privileges, and freedom of its citizens, to the observance of which the emperor bound himself by a golden bull. Setting out from Melnik for Thessalonica, Vatatzes called upon Demetrius to come to meet him and make the obeisance to which he was committed by oath. Demetrius, relying for advice upon those who were involved in the plot, failed to appear before the emperor. When Vatatzes encamped under the walls of Thessalonica in December, renewed his demand for submission, and also ordered that a market be provided for supplies for his army, Demetrius, still relying upon the same advisers, made no effort to obey the imperial commands. Lacking equipment, Vatatzes was unable to lay effective siege to the city, but after a few days a detachment of Nicene soldiers, set to guard a little gate overlooking

⁷³ Acropolites, 43, ed. Heisenberg, I, 72–75. In 1244 Vatatzes married Frederick's young daughter Constance, who took the Greek name Anna when she was received into Orthodoxy (Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1779–81, p. 19). Soon rejected by her husband in favor of one of her ladies in waiting, long kept a prisoner at Nicaea, later caught up in the Angevin invasion of Italy when her brother Manfred was slain, Constance finally died in Valencia, where her wooden sarcophagus is still preserved in the little church of S. John of the Hospital (see Giuseppe del Giudice, "La Famiglia di Re Manfredi," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, III [1878], 27 ff., and V [1880], 21 ff.; J. Miret y Sans, "Tres Princesas griegas en la corte de Jaime II de Aragón," *Revue hispanique*, XV [1906], 668 ff., 680–83, 690–702, 717–19; Chas. Diehl, *Figures byzantines*, II [1909], 207–25; C. Marinesco, "Du Nouveau sur Constance de Hohenstaufen, impératrice de Nicée," *Byzantion*, I [1924], 451–68; and Vasiliev, *Hist. Byz. Emp.* [1952], pp. 528–29). Constance was the daughter of Bianca Lancia, mother of Manfred. When in 1262 the Epirotes captured Alexius Strategopoulus (the Nicene general who had recovered Constantinople for Michael VIII) and sent him as a prisoner to Manfred, Constance was returned to her brother in exchange for Strategopoulus (see below, Chapter 5, note 27). She died in Valencia on 15 April, 1307, about seventy-five years old (see Miret y Sans, *op cit.*, pp. 700 ff.).

⁷⁴ Acropolites, 44, ed. Heisenberg, I, 75–79 (quotation on pp. 78–79); Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1787–89, pp. 20–21; and cf. Nicol, *Despotate of Epirus*, pp. 144–45.

the harbor to prevent a sortie from the city, heard a cry that the gate had been opened by some of those within the walls, and responding to the cry they got into the city, followed very shortly by the entire army and by the emperor himself, who took his stand at the east gate. There Irene, the beautiful widow of John Asen II, who had retired to Thessalonica, sought him out, and made a tearful plea on her knees that her brother Demetrius not be blinded. He promised to spare the young man that common disablement of the defeated. Then Irene produced Demetrius, a handsome, beardless, young man, who had taken refuge in the fortress on the acropolis. Vatatzes treated Irene with a grave courtesy; when she dismounted from her horse, he stepped from his carriage and stood on foot with her.⁷⁵ He could afford to be gracious, for he had just secured a greater city than Nicaea.

After the Latins had successfully broken the Greek-Bulgarian siege of the capital, a two years' truce (1236-1238) seems to have been made between Vatatzes and John of Brienne.⁷⁶ But the Latin regime had no future in Constantinople. It is astonishing that it survived as long as it did; there was something indomitable about the Greek leadership in Nicaea. Time was on the Greek side. Vatatzes wrote Pope Gregory IX, apparently late in the year 1237: "We have been forced to withdraw from Constantinople, but we do not beg as a favor [from anyone] our rights to the office and empire of Constantinople. The ruler has authority and power over a nation . . . a people, human beings, not over the sticks and stones which make up walls and defense towers."⁷⁷ Baldwin II's rule on the Bosphorus seemed to depend

upon the continuing support of Prince Geoffrey II of Achaea, and on 9 February, 1240, Gregory IX granted Geoffrey an indulgence to the effect that the vow he had made of going as a crusader to the Holy Land might be fulfilled, with all benefits, by rendering continued assistance to the beleaguered Latin empire, in which connection Geoffrey declared himself ready to lead a *decens comitiva militum*.⁷⁸ It would certainly be needed.

Geoffrey was at the pinnacle of his career. He was already seneschal of Romania, like his father, who had received the office at the first parliament of Ravennika (1209). In 1217 Geoffrey had married Agnes of Courtenay, sister of the Latin Emperors Robert and Baldwin II. During most of Geoffrey's eighteen years of rule peace prevailed in the principality of Achaea; he seems to have made little or no effort to subdue the Slavs of Mount Taygetus and the Tzakones of Mount Parnon; he did not undertake the reduction of the great fortress town of Monemvasia, whose inhabitants were a menace to Latin shipping and maintained close relations with John Vatatzes. Although he had trouble with the Ducae of Epirus and Thessalonica, he apparently avoided serious conflict with them. Geoffrey died in 1246, the same year in which Vatatzes brought to an end the checkered history of the Greek empire and despotate of Thessalonica.

When the Latin Emperor John of Brienne died in March, 1237, his successor, the young Baldwin of Courtenay, was in France and Flanders, vindicating his rights to the great castle of Namur against the rival claims of a sister.⁷⁹ The Nicene had every reason to cast hopeful eyes upon the stout walls of Constantinople. On 21 May, before he had learned of Brienne's death, Pope Gregory IX wrote from Viterbo "to the nobleman Vatatzes" a supercilious letter announcing a great crusade for the protection of the Holy Land and, if need be, for the assistance of the Latin "empire of Romania," which was threatened by Vatatzes. The pope warned the latter against pursuing a policy hostile to John of Brienne and the Latins in Constantinople, and demanded rather his

⁷⁵ Acropolites, 45, ed. Heisenberg, I, 79-83; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1790-91, p. 21; O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique des origines au quatorzième siècle*, Paris, 1919, pp. 228-31.

⁷⁶ Robert Saulger, *Histoire . . . de l'Archipel* (1698), pp. 45-46: ". . . l'Empereur [John of Brienne] sollicité par le Duc de Naxe [i.e., Angelo Sanudo, at the behest of Vatatzes] consentit à une trêve de deux ans . . ." (p. 46). In the summer of 1238 the fleet of Geoffrey II, co-operating with the Venetians, again aided the Latin capital against Vatatzes (cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* [1949], pp. 176, 180).

⁷⁷ Doc. published by J. Sakkellion, in the Greek periodical *Athenaion*, I (Athens, 1872), 375 (*sic*), and summarized in Ant. Meliarakes, *History of the Empire of Nicaea and the Despotate of Epirus* (in Greek), Athens, 1898, p. 277. (The translation is a paraphrase.)

⁷⁸ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, III (1908), no. 4983, col. 141.

⁷⁹ Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1237, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII (1874), 941. Pope Gregory IX was vigilant on the young Baldwin's behalf (Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, III [1908], nos. 4944-45, 5047, 5305).

"aid, counsel, and support" for the Latins.⁸⁰ Gregory's letter was so lofty in tone that Vatatzes, in replying, professed to believe it could not really have come from the pope himself. He answered it, nevertheless, with even less restraint than the papal chancery had shown, as though he were repaying an old score of resentment. He declared that the see of Rome was in no wise different from the other ancient bishoprics, and that he, and no usurping Latin, was the direct successor of the great Constantine, the Ducae, and the Comneni. The papacy should never have condoned the Latin seizure of Constantinople nor contrived the election of the late John of Brienne. The Greeks had merely yielded to brute force in withdrawing from their capital. The conduct of the Latins and the existence of their alleged empire were inconsistent with the papal hope of freeing the Holy Land. Carrying on the fight against John of Brienne, now "long dead" (*πάλαι*), whom the pope had asked Vatatzes to leave in peace, had been a sacred duty for the recovery of Constantinople. While Vatatzes was prepared to respect the rights of the pope, the latter must also recognize those of the Greek emperor.⁸¹

Vatatzes' letter, whether it was ever actually sent to Pope Gregory or not, is certainly an exact statement of Nicene views concerning the Latin empire, which lasted from year to year, precariously and unheroically, preserved from the time of Brienne's accession largely by the

rivalry between Nicaea and Bulgaria. Planning his campaign against the weakened "empire" of Thessalonica in the early summer of 1241, Vatatzes arranged with the young Baldwin II a two years' truce,⁸² and about the same time renewed with Koloman, son of the late John Asen II, the Bulgarian alliance, which was always convenient while it lasted.⁸³ Some time after the expiration of the truce with Baldwin, Vatatzes renewed it for one year (in 1244).⁸⁴ In the meantime, of course, Gregory IX had died (in August, 1241, at Rome), and after the brief papacy of Celestine IV and a long interregnum Sinibaldo Fieschi was elected pope as Innocent IV in June, 1243. He is best known for his presidency of the first Council of Lyon and his unremitting struggle with the Hohenstaufen Emperor Frederick II.

But we are not done yet with the reign of Pope Gregory IX, for as his life drew to a close, his anxious concern for the tottering empire of Constantinople increased: "Sad is the news we have heard from the city of Constantinople," he wrote to the Latin hierarchy in Greece, including the archbishops of Patras and Corinth, Thebes and Athens (on 18 January, 1238), "and no little the grief it has caused us, but we hasten to apply a remedy to counter the perilous ills of which men tell us." There was famine in the imperial city, and desertion in the ranks; grain was needed, and warriors to defend the city. The count of Brittany, Pierre de Dreux, was coming with an army while the pope undertook to supply food. But if the need was great, the distance from which help had to come was no less great. Quick action was required, and so his Holiness commanded the Latin hierarchy to pay a third of their movable goods and a third of their incomes to Master Philip, a man provident and discreet, who was being sent to Greece to collect the funds. The Crusaders' remission of sins was to be the reward of those who brought aid to the threatened city. Not unaware, however, that the several archbishops whom he was addressing, and their numerous

⁸⁰ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 18, fol. 291, published in W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, append., no. VII, pp. 751–52; Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), no. 3693, cols. 659–60; and see especially V. Grumel, "L'Authenticité de la lettre de Jean Vatatzès, empereur de Nicée, au pape Grégoire IX," *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX (1930), 450–58, who gives an improved text of the papal letter, "datum Viterbii, XII Kalendas Iunii, [pontificatus nostri] anno undecimo." It is interesting to note that on 13 March, 1238, Gregory IX charged the Hospitallers with aiding Vatatzes (Auvray, II, no. 4156, cols. 919–20). The first direct papal taxation of the Church in Greece occurs in 1238 to raise funds for the protection of Constantinople against Vatatzes and John Asen II (cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1238, nos. 1–5, vol. XXI [Bar-le-Duc, 1870], pp. 168–69, and see Adolf Gottlob, *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-Steuern des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Heiligenstadt [Eichsfeld], 1892, p. 64).

⁸¹ Meliarakes, *History of the Empire of Nicaea and the Despotate of Epirus*, pp. 276–79 (from J. Sakkellion, *Athension*, I [Athens, 1873], 372–78); Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1757, p. 16; V. Grumel, *Échos d'Orient*, XXIX, 452–58, who has shown that Vatatzes' letter is genuine although it may never have been sent to Rome, at least in its present redaction.

⁸² Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1241, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII, 950; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1773, p. 18.

⁸³ Acropolites, *Chron.*, 39–40, ed. Heisenberg, I, 64–65; Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines, *loc. cit.*; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1773a, p. 18.

⁸⁴ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, no. 57), IV (London, 1877), 299; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1781a, p. 19; and in general cf. Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 323–26.

clergy, would not much approve the papal remedy, his Holiness reminded them that their safety was bound up with the safety of Constantinople, and he added that his emissary was instructed to compel them, if necessary, to make the contribution he required of them.⁸⁵

At the same time as this unhappy news was dispatched to the Latin clergy in the Morea and the Athenian lordship an appeal was addressed to Count Matteo Orsini of Cephalonia and Zante, who was also reminded that his interests were similarly at stake, "if, God forbid, the Greeks should obtain possession of the aforesaid city." Besides the remission of sins, Count Matteo was promised, for his help, unending praise among men and the crown of supernal achievement in heaven.⁸⁶ But conditions did not improve; indeed, they were never to improve; and a year later, on 23 January, 1239, Pope Gregory again imposed the levy of a third of their goods upon the Latin hierarchy in Greece, on behalf of the empire of Romania, for "the need was more urgent than ever."⁸⁷ Furthermore, the danger was close to home, for papal documents of 12 July, 1235, and 27 June, 1236, refer to the frequency and the severity of Greek attacks upon Thebes,⁸⁸ the home and capital, presumably, of Guy I de la Roche, "Megaskyr" of the Athenian lordship. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that the Greeks suffered any particular hardships in Thebes and Athens because of the attacks of their fellows upon lands of Guy de la Roche. No particular disability was imposed upon the Greek monks at this time, at least as far as we can tell. In 1238 a Greek named Neophytus, possibly a monk, was allowed to build or repair a road leading up to the monastery of S. John the Hunter on Mount Hymettus, as an iambic

inscription testifies, and asks the traveler using the road to pray for its builder's soul.⁸⁹

During the last decades of its existence the Latin empire of Constantinople dwindled, almost to the city itself and its suburbs. Its natural defenders in the West were occupied with other problems. Even as early as 1216 the death of the Emperor Henry, although it created a profound impression in the East, attracted only moderate attention in the West.⁹⁰ The hope which Innocent III had once entertained of the effective union of the churches under the papacy and the new Latin hierarchy in the East had been frustrated, and after Honorius III the popes had to pay less attention to the manifold problems of the Latin empire and its constantly imperiled capital. Gregory IX and Innocent IV were caught up in the struggle with the Hohenstaufen. The Emperor Baldwin, lord of Courtenay, naturally looked to his native France for aid, but Louis IX thought chiefly of the Crusade, and the Latin empire had proved a liability to the Crusade. Baldwin was well known in France, where he spent much of the years 1236–1239 and 1244–1248. The queen mother, Blanche of Castile, found him *enfantif en ses paroles*.⁹¹ The loss of the Latin empire was not far distant. It was not entirely Baldwin's fault. If he was weak, he was a better and a braver man than his brother and predecessor Robert. If the empire was impoverished, Baldwin spent generously the resources of his lordship of Courtenay and his county of Namur in its defense. His misfortune was that he was neither a warrior nor a diplomat. There were no native defenders in Constantinople to aid him, or very few, for the Emperor Henry's policy of putting Greeks into responsible positions both in the state and in the army, hoping that they might identify themselves with the Latin regime, help create the illusion of continuity with the past, and protect their own interest in the *status quo*, if nothing else, had been abandoned. On one occasion Blanche of Castile wrote Baldwin of her chagrin to learn that he was guided by the counsel of

⁸⁵ Greg. IX, an. XI, ep. 358 (Lampros, *Eggrapha* [1906], pt. I, doc. 25, pp. 38–39); Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), no. 4035, cols. 858–60; Potthast, no. 10,502 (vol. I, p. 890). Master Philip apparently met with some difficulty in collecting funds when he arrived in Greece (Greg. IX, an. XII, ep. 265, doc. dated 27 September, 1238, in Auvray, II, no. 4546, col. 1145, and cf. no. 4547). Count Pierre of Brittany had planned his expedition to Constantinople before October, 1236 (Auvray, II, no. 3363, cols. 497–98, and cf. no. 4027, col. 853, dated 12 January, 1238).

⁸⁶ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pp. 39–40; Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II, no. 4036, col. 860; Potthast, *Regesta*, no. 10,503 (vol. I, p. 890), dated 18 January, 1238.

⁸⁷ Greg. IX, an. XII, ep. 370 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 27, pp. 42–43); *Reg. Grég. IX*, II, no. 4711, cols. 1210–11.

⁸⁸ *Reg. Grég. IX*, II, nos. 2671 and 3214, cols. 108 and 421.

⁸⁹ *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, IV (1856–59), no. 8752, p. 345, to which reference is once more made, below, in Chapter 16, note 85.

⁹⁰ Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 152.

⁹¹ *Récit d'un ménestrel de Reims*, ed. Natalis de Wailly, Paris, 1876, chap. xli, p. 225, cited by Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 178; *Chronicle of Reims*, chap. xli, trans. E. N. Stone, *University of Washington Publications in the Social Sciences*, X (Seattle, 1939), 348.

two Greeks (*videlicet exhortacionibus duorum Grecorum*), but Baldwin sent the queen mother the most solemn and subservient assurance, *teste Altissimo*, "that we have never in the past taken the advice of any Greeks, nor do we now, nor shall we; rather whatever we do is done on the advice of the noble and good men of France who are with us. . . ."⁹² However valuable their advice may have been, these noble and good men of France were not numerous enough to give Baldwin the support he needed.

The poverty of the Latin emperor was exceeded only by that of the Latin patriarch in Constantinople, and, if the Latin empire and the Latin church were to survive, help had to come from the outside. Under the circumstances the pope did his best. A change may now be noted in the tone of papal letters concerned with the affairs of the Latin patriarchate. The irritation and even anger which Innocent III and Honorius III had again and again expressed at the patriarchal independence and disobedience have been replaced by anxiety and sympathy. On 29 May, 1241, Gregory IX wrote to the archbishop of Thebes, the prior of the Dominicans, and the archdeacon of Negroponte that a tithe was to be paid to the Latin patriarch of the revenues of the cathedral churches, monasteries, and the clergy, both Latin and Greek, in the Morea, Negroponte, and the islands subject to the see of Constantinople. The proud see which had once, as we have seen, contested the authority of the Roman pontiff, was now reduced to such penury that Gregory could not contemplate its plight without grief, "and yet there was no one willing or able to extend a helping hand."⁹³

⁹² *Ep. Bald. Imp. CP., B. reg. Francorum*, dated at Constantinople on 5 August, 1243, in Alex. Teulet, *Layettes du trésor des chartes*, II (Paris, 1866), doc. 3123, p. 519.

⁹³ Greg. IX, an. XV, ep. 60, ed. Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, fasc. 12 (1910), no. 6035, col. 515: ". . . nec est qui velit vel valeat subsidii porrigere sibi manum. . . ." In 1236 the pope had informed the Latin hierarchy in the Morea that the Latin patriarch had lost almost all his revenues and other goods, owing to the fortunes of war and the wickedness of the Greeks (*Reg. Grég. IX*, II, no. 3382, col. 506). Later in the same year a tithe was declared in the Morea for the benefit of the Latin empire (*ibid.*, nos. 3408–9, cols. 521–23). To Leo Santifaller's *Beiträge zur Geschichte d. Lateinischen Patriarchats* (1938) and R. L. Wolff's articles on the Latin patriarchate, should be added Giorgio Fedalto, "Il Patriarcato latino di Costantinopoli (1204–1261)," *Studia patavina*, XVIII (1971), 390–464.

The Emperor Baldwin II had spent the period from 1236 to 1239 in western Europe, seeking aid for his threatened capital and also asserting his rights to the lordship of Courtenay in France and the county of Namur in Flanders, but in 1239–1240 he returned to Constan-

tinople with a considerable military force; he had been especially aided by King Louis IX of France and the pope, who had sought to divert the "crusade" of 1239 from the Holy Land for his benefit (Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 179–82). Baldwin had previously wished to turn over to Geoffrey II of Villehardouin the lordship of Courtenay, in return for funds and help, but Louis IX had refused to sanction the grant ([Jean] du Bouchet, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Courtenay*, Paris, 1661, pp. 74–76).
 As the months and years passed, the Latin empire of Constantinople came increasingly to look like a poor investment; the papacy, nevertheless, continued to make some effort to support the Emperor Baldwin. On 13 July, 1243, Innocent IV directed the churches of Athens, Corinth, the Archipelago, Patras, Thebes, and Negroponte to provide, "from your ecclesiastical revenues," ten thousand hyperperi, as a subsidy "for the preservation of the empire of Constantinople, won by the faithful of Christ not without many labors and much cost, and even no little shedding of blood."⁹⁴ Eleven days later, on 24 July, the archbishop of Athens and Crescentius, treasurer of the Parthenon, and William, dean of the Theban minster, were informed of the papal declaration of another tithe, to be collected in the coming year in the Morea, Negroponte, and the islands. The chancery clerk who prepared this letter copied the text of Gregory IX's lament of 29 May, 1241: the penury of the once opulent church of the imperial capital was grievous to behold, its misery extreme, the empire in sore distress and disruption, the patriarchate in a desperate plight, *nec est qui velit vel valeat subsidii porrigere sibi manum*.⁹⁵ On 16 May, 1244, Innocent again wrote to Prince Geoffrey II of Villehardouin, reminding him that he was the emperor's near neighbor in anxiety and peril, and urging him to rise, *libenter et potenter*, on the imperial behalf,⁹⁶ and two weeks thereafter we find his Holiness again writing on the subject of the year's defense levy, in terms rather similar to those in his letter to Villehardouin, now providing, however, for compulsion and assistance from the secular arm if the Latin hierarchy in Greece proved unduly reluctant to provide the requested funds.⁹⁷ But as hope of reviving

tinople with a considerable military force; he had been especially aided by King Louis IX of France and the pope, who had sought to divert the "crusade" of 1239 from the Holy Land for his benefit (Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 179–82). Baldwin had previously wished to turn over to Geoffrey II of Villehardouin the lordship of Courtenay, in return for funds and help, but Louis IX had refused to sanction the grant ([Jean] du Bouchet, *Histoire généalogique de la maison royale de Courtenay*, Paris, 1661, pp. 74–76).

⁹⁴ Berger, *Registres d'Innocent IV*, I, no. 22, pp. 6–7.

⁹⁵ *Reg. Inn. IV*, I, no. 33, pp. 8–9. (Imperial abbeyes and houses of the Templars and Hospitalers were exempted from payment of the tithe.) On 2 September the pope again wrote to the churches of Athens and Thebes concerning this tithe (*ibid.*, no. 94, p. 21).

⁹⁶ *Reg. Inn. IV*, I, no. 706, p. 120; Potthast, no. 11,388 (vol. II, p. 967).

⁹⁷ *Reg. Inn. IV*, I, no. 707, p. 120, doc. dated 30 May, 1244.

the lost strength of the Latin empire faded, papal efforts grew less insistent. The pope continued to write letters and to make gestures; if the lay powers in the Levant would aid the emperor, so would the papacy, but not otherwise.

It seems very likely that some of the reluctance of the Latin hierarchy in Greece to give substantial aid to the Latin empire was due to their conviction that they had a better use for their resources at home. The capital was distant, and seemed to be doomed. The Latins in Boudonitza, Athens, and Thebes were near neighbors of the Ducae in Epirus and, until 1246, in Thessalonica. Proximity to the Despot Michael II of Epirus (1231–ca. 1267) was worrisome, and yet the Latins lacked the foresight to see, if such was indeed the case, that their first line of defense was actually the Bosphorus. As we have already stated, Pope Gregory IX bears witness to the “frequent attacks upon and devastation of the city of Thebes, which the Greeks have often laid waste.”⁹⁸ A letter of his successor suggests that fear of the Greek menace along the border had scarcely diminished a decade later.

⁹⁸ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), nos. 2671 and 3214, cols. 108 and 421, letters dated 12 July, 1235, and 27 June, 1236: “. . . propter frequentes guerrarum impulsus et vastationem civitatis Thebane, que a Grecis sepius est vastata. . . .” Cf. above, note 88.

To the patriarch of Constantinople, then legate of the Apostolic See, Pope Innocent IV wrote from the Lateran Palace, on 29 April, 1244, that he had been informed by Guy de la Roche, the lord of Athens, that certain Greek monks in a village on his northern border (*quod Laragie vulgariter nuncupatur*) were furnishing his Greek enemies, of Epirus or Thessalonica or both, with secrets, apparently of a military nature, “whence great dangers resulted for the faithful.” Guy had therefore requested that these monks be removed to other Greek abbeys in his domains, and that Latin monks or some secular clergy be put in their stead. The patriarch was instructed to act, after a proper investigation, so as to preserve the honor of the Church and the safety of the land.⁹⁹ There was every need for caution, for Michael II of Epirus was now well launched on his long and troublesome career, and in 1246 (as we have seen) the Greek “despotate” of Thessalonica was taken over by the emperor John III Vatatzes, and added to the ever-increasing domains of imperial Nicaea, which thus became a danger to the lord of Athens as well as to the emperor of Constantinople.

⁹⁹ Inn. IV, an. I, ep. 656 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 28, pp. 43–44); Berger, *Registres d’Innocent IV*, I, no. 657, pp. 112–13; Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Latein. Patriarchats*, p. 208.

4. THE ADVANCE OF NICAEEA AND THE DECLINE OF THE LATIN EMPIRE (1246–1259)

Geoffrey II was succeeded in 1246 by his brother William of Villehardouin, the most lordly of the princes of Achaea. By playing off the despotate of Epirus and the empire of Nicaea against each other, while committing himself irrevocably to neither side, William might have enlarged his principality in the south and made predominant his influence in the affairs of Greece without great danger to himself and his vassals. But William had more serious problems to face than his brother had had. Some of his trouble arose from the miserable condition of the Latin empire of Constantinople, to the affairs of which contemporaries attached an undue importance. The imperial title stirred the imagination, *nomen et omen*, and location in Constantinople made the Latin emperor and the baronage the center of both popular interest and diplomatic maneuvering. Titular head of the Latin feudatories in Greece, the emperor was never in a position to supply leadership to his alleged vassals after the death of Henry of Hainaut in 1216. As a whole Venice looked after her barons in the Aegean, sometimes more closely than they wished, and the papacy sought to protect the other Latins in Greece. To some extent the Villehardouin, especially William, tried to take the lead in the affairs of Frankish Greece, but lacked the prerogative, if not the prestige, to do so. Undoubtedly, too, the Latin lords enjoyed their independence and saw no particular enemy against whom they should combine.

Prince William is the hero of the Chronicle of the Morea. He had first seen the light in his father's castle at Kalamata, some ruins of which still stand on a hill in the northern part of the modern town. Greek was almost his native language. He began his long and colorful reign (1246–1278) with the successful siege of Monemvasia (1246–1248), in which he was assisted by Guy I de la Roche, the second lord of Athens, his vassal for the Moreote fiefs of Argos and Nauplia, and also by the triarchs of Negroponte, Duke Angelo Sanudo of the Archipelago, some of the lesser lords of the Aegean, and the Orsini count of Cephalonia. William granted the Monemvasiotes the franchise; left the chief archontic families of the

fallen city undisturbed in their possessions; and built castles to extend his sway in the central and southeastern parts of the Morea. The Tzakones of Mount Parnon, the ancient Laconians, were made to submit to his authority, and during the winter of 1248–1249, which William spent in Lacedaemonia (la Crémone), he began the famous castle on the steep heights of Mistra, some four miles west of Sparta. (Mistra was destined to a great future, but not under Latin hegemony.) William next built the castle of Grand Magne on the site of Old Maina, on the Laconian Gulf near Cape Matapan, tip of the central prong of the Moreote peninsula. Some miles northwest of Old Maina he built another castle called Beaufort, "and in Greek called Levtra," on the eastern shore of the Messenian Gulf, just across from the Venetian station of Coron. These fortresses produced a more submissive attitude among the Slavic tribe of the Melings of Taygetus and even among the natives of Maina, who were not eager to provoke William's armed intervention in their affairs. During these years of the mid-century the power and prestige of the prince of Achaea reached their height, and the Emperor Baldwin is said to have given (presumably to William in 1248) suzerainty over the duchy of Naxos in the Archipelago,¹ over the island of Negroponte, and probably over the margraviate of Boudonitza.

¹ See David Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, Paris, 1971, pp. 21–23. Jean Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 149–53, believes that Prince William of Achaea acquired a limited suzerainty over the duchy of Naxos as a consequence of the agreements of 1267 (on which see below); the event has been assigned by Hopf, Wm. Miller, and others to the year 1236, when Geoffrey II of Villehardouin came to the aid of Constantinople, and broke the siege of the city by Vatatzes and John Asen II (on which see above). Besides the alleged suzerainty over Boudonitza, the prince of Achaea acquired that over Negroponte, where the triarchs were to furnish him on request one galley or eight knights each year although the Venetians exercised control *de facto* over the island. Cf. Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del regno di Romania*, in Chas. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 100, and Hopf, *Storia dell'isola di Andros e dei suoi signori*, trans. G. B. Sardagna, Venice, 1859, pp. 33–34, and doc. VIII, *ibid.*, p. 167; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 89–90; but in the general confusion the interpretation of Jacoby, *loc. cit.*, seems the most reasonable.

Prince William seemed to meet no obstacle he could not overcome, and his principality attained its fullest extent and security during the half dozen or more years which followed the taking of Monemvasia. Marino Sanudo the Elder has borne witness to the magnificence of his court, the fame of his warriors, and the well-being of his subjects. Merchants traversed the realm in safety, traveled without hard cash, lodged with their agents, received money on a written draft, and in this way paid their expenses and did business. William had gone to meet Louis IX at Cyprus in May, 1249, with twenty-four ships and four hundred horse, having left behind a hundred knights at Rhodes, to assist the Genoese who had just seized the great island and were trying to hold it against attacks from Nicaea.² William is said to have received at this time the right to coin *deniers tournois* like those of the royal mints in France; and he accompanied Louis on the Seventh Crusade to Egypt, where he spent the winter of 1249–1250, returning home when the king went to Acre in early May, 1250. "His court was always attended by 700 to 1,000 horse," says Marino Sanudo, "and this I have learned from Messer Marco [II] Sanudo, grandfather of Messer Niccolò [1323–1341], who once lived at the court of this prince." Duke Hugh IV of Burgundy, later titular Latin king of Thessalonica, spent the winter of 1248–1249 with William, rode with him along the banks of the Eurotas, and went on the crusade to Egypt with him. Marino Sanudo was probably repeating the words of his old friend and kinsman, Duke Marco II of the Archipelago, when he wrote "that the court [of William of Villehardouin] appeared greater than a great king's court." On one occasion when the Greeks, presumably the Epirotes under Michael II, are said to have attacked Boudonitza, "which was on the [northern] confines of his state," William went to meet them with some 8,000 horse, of whom 3,000 were men-at-arms (*armigeri*); he defeated them roundly, and caused them to regret their undertaking. If the figures are not exaggerated, this was a large cavalry force for that generation, further evidence of the great resources of the Moreote principality.³ But like the protagonist in a Greek

tragedy William was soon to meet a reversal of fortune, a *peripeteia*, which would completely alter the hitherto prosperous course of Latin affairs in Greece.

Before returning to Asia Minor early in 1247, the Emperor John III Vatatzes appointed as governor of Thessalonica and Berrhoea his grand domestic Andronicus Palaeologus, whose son, the later Emperor Michael VIII, was given charge of Serres and Melnik.⁴ Michael Palaeologus's ambition was soon to be well known, and a half-dozen years later (according to the historian George Pachymeres) he was accused of treasonable communication with Michael II of Epirus,⁵ who after the Nicene acquisition of Thessalonica remained the only primary power in continental Greece, becoming in fact Vatatzes' serious competitor. The fallen Demetrius was imprisoned in the fortress of Lentiana (ἐν τῷ φρουρίῳ . . . τῶν Λεντιανῶν) in Asia Minor,⁶ where he appears to have died, but old Theodore, his father, who had lived chiefly at Vodena since his return from Bulgaria in 1237, had one last opportunity to express his hostility to the pretensions of Nicaea, now so largely realized, by inveigling his nephew Michael II into an attack upon Vatatzes' new possessions in the west (1251). Michael could no more be trusted, in the opinion

101–3, and cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 218–19. D. M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957, pp. 142 and 155, note 2, dates the Epirote attack upon Boudonitza in 1246 when Michael II is known to have recovered Halmyros from the Venetians, who had taken possession of the Gulf of Volos after the death of the Despot Manuel of Thessalonica (in 1241).

According to Sanudo, *op. cit.*, p. 102, Louis IX granted William of Villehardouin "che'l potesse battere torneselli della lega del rè, mettendo in una libra tre onze e mezza d'argento." The Moreote *denier tournois*, which (Sanudo says) contained 3½ ounces of silver to the pound in 1250, had a silver content of only 2½ ounces to the pound by 1340 when Francesco Balducci Pegolotti wrote *La Pratica della mercatura* (see the edition by Allan Evans, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, pp. 116–17, 118, and Gustave Schlumberger, *Numismatique de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1878, pp. 308–14, and plate XII, nos. 11–15).

⁴ Acropolites, 46, *ibid.*, I, 83–84.

⁵ Geo. Pachymeres, *De Michael Palaeologo*, I, 7 (Bonn, I, 21). Acropolites, 50–51, ed. Heisenberg, I, 92–101, who deals at great length with the trial of Michael Palaeologus, claims that popular rumor improperly linked Michael with the Bulgarian Tsar Koloman, whose sister it was alleged he was going to marry. Cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, II, 8, 3 (Bonn, I, 49), and D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 21–26.

⁶ Acropolites, 46, ed. Heisenberg, I, 84.

² Cf. Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 48, ed. Aug. Heisenberg, I (Leipzig, 1903), 86–88. The Genoese were finally obliged to surrender the island to Vatatzes. Cf. the historical notes and references in Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 (1932), no. 1803, p. 22.

³ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp.

of Acropolites, than the Ethiopian could become white. Vatatzes replied to the unexpected aggression in a long and lucky campaign in 1252, which reduced Michael's pride and prestige for some time, and extended the hegemony of Nicaea throughout western Macedonia and for a while into Albania. The price of peace, which Michael promptly paid, was the surrender of certain towns he had captured and the surrender also of old Theodore, who like his son Demetrius now concluded his eventful life in a Nicene prison.⁷ During this period Italian affairs tended to distract the attention of the Curia Romana from Greece, and as each success brought Vatatzes closer to Constantinople, the Curia gave the Latin empire less and less chance of survival.

On 20 August, 1252, Innocent IV wrote the bishops of Negroponte and Olena that, if his beloved sons the doge of Venice, the prince of Achaia, and the other barons of Romania had decided to take the field "for a whole year of war" in defense of the city of Constantinople, "which should be maintained and protected from the assault of Vatatzes," they were to be paid the sum of one thousand marks of silver, as a subsidy for the defense of the city, from the revenues already collected of the churches of Athens and Corinth. If these revenues did not reach this amount, the deficit was to be made up "from the goods of the prelates and clerics of Romania."⁸ This document stands, however, more in testimony of the apparent wealth of the Church of Athens, together with that of Corinth, than of papal anxiety over the Latin community in Constantinople, because Innocent IV did not now exert himself unduly over the trials of the Latin empire and the tribulations of its emperor. Indeed, from about the middle of the century Innocent, who died in November, 1254, and Alexander IV, who succeeded him, were probably both prepared to withdraw their support of the Emperor Baldwin and his tottering throne, having become reconciled to the Nicene ruler's realization of an ambition now a half-century old, provided only they could, by seeing Constantinople return to a Greek emperor and a Greek patriarch, secure that union of the Churches, so long desired, so long unfulfilled. Negotiations between Rome and Nicaea illustrate

this change in the papal attitude toward the Latin empire.

Seeking means of securing Constantinople, Vatatzes had long given serious attention to the perennial problem of church union,⁹ for the papacy was the prime support of the Latin empire,¹⁰ but perhaps no decisive action could be attempted until after the death of Frederick II, the pope's arch-opponent and Vatatzes' close ally and father-in-law (from 1244). Nevertheless, efforts at church union were renewed in the mission which the famous John of Parma, minister-general of the Franciscans, undertook for Innocent IV to the court of Vatatzes at Easter (4 April), 1249. John and his companions returned to Lyon, where Innocent was residing with the Curia Romana, some time before Easter, 1251, and the Byzantine envoys to whom the pope addressed a letter (dated at Lyon on 8 August, 1250) either came with them or soon followed them, bringing a synodal letter from the Nicene Patriarch Manuel II.¹¹ Although the patriarch emphasized the importance of effecting the union of the Churches on spiritual grounds, he reminded the pope that there were various points of difference

⁹ Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 348-65; K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), 33-34; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1737a, 1737b, 1795, and 1804.

¹⁰ Despite the violent distractions of his reign caused by the contest with Frederick II (the "negotium Siciliae"), Innocent IV took various steps *ad Constantinopolitanam conservationem imperii* and made certain provisions for the well-being of the Latin Church in Greece and the islands (1243-1254), as shown by his letters in Berger, *Registres d'Innocent IV*, I (Paris, 1884), nos. 8, 22, 32-33, 94, 199, 657, 706, 730, 1385, 1480, 1748, 1826, 1842, 2058, 2298, 2405; vol. II (Paris, 1887), nos. 4560-62, 4565, 4749-50, 4906-7, 5422; vol. III (Paris, 1897), nos. 5472, 5728, 5755-58, 5774, 6073, 6117, 6210, 6344, 6362, 6431, 6472, 6479-80, 6583, 6632, 6643-44, 6657, 6668, 6671, 6676, 6804, 6828, 6831-33, 6835-36, 6838-39, 6845-46, 6848-50, 6894, 6952, 7245-46, 7450, 7845. Documents relating to Cyprus and the Holy Land are not noted here.

¹¹ On the mission of John of Parma to the Nicene court (1249-1251), see Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 222-26, and for the text of the papal letter of 8 August, 1250, see, *ibid.*, I, 227-28, from which it is clear that Innocent IV took the initiative in sending the embassy to the Greeks, and that John of Parma, *humilis pacis angelus*, was very well received by Vatatzes and the Patriarch Manuel II. (Golubovich, *loc. cit.*, gives passages relating to John of Parma's mission to Nicaea from Salimbene's chronicle, Niccolò di Curbio's life of Innocent IV, and Angelo Clareno's *Tribulationes*.)

⁷ Acropolites, 49, *ibid.*, I, 89-92; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1806, p. 23. (Heisenberg's edition of Acropolites will be usually indicated hereafter by an *ibidem*.)

⁸ Élie Berger, ed., *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, III (Paris, 1897), no. 5923, p. 100.

(κεφάλαια) between them which required settlement.¹³ But the Byzantine envoys seemed anxious for settlement, offering remarkable concessions in return for the restoration of Constantinople to the Greeks, the re-establishment of the Byzantine patriarch in all his rights, and of course the withdrawal of the Latin emperor and Latin patriarch from the city. In return Vatatzes and the Patriarch Manuel were willing to settle two centuries of schism in the following way: the see of Rome would be recognized as the highest patriarchal see by inscribing the names of the popes on the Byzantine diptychs; the Greek clergy would render the pope general canonical obedience; the see of Rome would be the court of appeal for the Greek clergy when oppressed by their superiors (Rome had claimed such appellate jurisdiction since the Council of Sardica in A.D. 343), and higher ecclesiastics would also be free to settle their disputes by appeal to papal decision; papal decrees would be binding in law, provided they were not at variance with the canons; and the pope would preside at councils, be the first to sign their proceedings, and have the right to speak first on matters of faith, but always in accord with scripture and canonical precept. Although the Greek legates emphasized that this statement of submission would not apply to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit (always a controverted point between the Greeks and Latins), Vatatzes was apparently willing to sacrifice the independence of the Byzantine Church to secure the return of Constantinople.¹³

¹³ Georg Hofmann, "Patriarch von Nikaia Manuel II. an Papst Innozenz IV.," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XIX (1953), 59–70, with an edition of the Greek text (from a Bodleian MS., Cod. Barroccianus 131, fols. 360r–361v, on which cf. H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum MSS. bibl. Bodleianae*, I [Oxford, 1853], 227), of which Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, append., no. XII, pp. 756–59, had already published a German summary with the wrong date 1253.

¹⁴ The facts are given at some length in the instructions which Pope Alexander IV gave Bishop Constantine of Orvieto, whom he was sending as papal legate to the Nicene court in 1256 when Vatatzes' successor, Theodore II Lascaris, indicated a desire to continue the discussions which his father had carried on with Innocent IV (see Alexander IV's instructions to Bishop Constantine in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1256, esp. nos. 48–50, vol. XXI [Bar-le-Duc, 1870], pp. 516–17, and Fritz Schillmann, ed., "Zur byzantinischen Politik Alexanders IV.," *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXII [Rome, 1908], 115, 116). Cf. C. Bourel de la Roncière, ed., *Les Registres d'Alexandre IV*, I (Paris, 1902), no. 1406, p. 430, doc. undated; Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 328, 367–77, with chronological errors; and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1812, pp. 23–24, for the other sources.

Pope Innocent found the Nicene proposals acceptable. He was quite willing to abandon the imperial wraith on the Bosphorus to revive the unity and authority of Christendom. Rarely had such a measure of agreement been achieved in generations of discussion directed toward church union, but both Innocent and Vatatzes died in the year 1254,¹⁴ and their accord was never put into effect. On 2 January, 1255, shortly after his election to the papacy, Alexander IV expressed concern for the safety of the Latin empire of Constantinople and the baronies in the Morea, and demanded *oportuna et congrua subsidia* from both the clergy and laity in the principality of Achaëa to protect the Catholic lands in Greece against enemy attacks.¹⁵ Despite the well-known activity of Alexander's chancery, however, which directed numerous letters to the Holy Land as well as to all parts of Europe, his registers reveal that he and his advisers paid relatively little attention to Greek affairs. But they would be quite willing to resume Innocent IV's negotiations with the Greeks if the opportunity presented itself.

At the end of February, 1254, the great Emperor John III Vatatzes suffered an apoplectic stroke at Nicaea. His physicians sought to revive him by lacerating his feet, and tried a number of other remedies which the medical art of the day prescribed (ὅποσα ἡ τέχνη ἐδίδασκεν). The emperor lay motionless in a coma all that night and the next day and the following night. Then his labored breathing was heard; although he regained consciousness, his color was ghastly. He insisted, however, upon going im-

¹⁴ Although the common reading of Acropolites' text (*Chron.*, 52, ed. Heisenberg, I, 103), that Vatatzes died on the "third of the calends of November," should obviously be interpreted as 30 October, V. Laurent, "La Date de la mort de l'empereur Jean III Batatzès," *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVI (1937), 162–65, has shown that Acropolites actually meant 3 November. This is the only passage in which Acropolites uses the calends (there was no "Greek calends"), and he apparently did not know how to employ it in dating. Innocent IV died on 7 December. When the papal-imperial negotiations appeared on the brink of success, Vatatzes seems to have issued a bronze coin with the figure of S. Peter holding two large keys in his right hand. Cf. David Lathoud and Tommaso Bertelè, "Le Chiavi di San Pietro su una moneta di Giovanni Doucas Vatatzes, imperatore niceno (1222–1254)," *Unitas: Rivista internazionale* (Ital. ed.), III (Rome, 1948), 203–12.

¹⁵ Bourel de la Roncière, *Registres d'Alexandre IV*, I, no. 34, pp. 9–10. Cf. *ibid.*, I, nos. 182–83, 621, 1406, and vol. II, eds. Joseph de Loye and Pierre de Cenival, Paris, 1917, no. 2072, p. 637, as well as nos. 2099 and 2458.

mediately to Nymphaeum in order to arrive before Palm Sunday, which he was accustomed to celebrate there. He arrived in time for Palm Sunday and the Easter holiday. His devotions provided no cure, as further attacks occurred both in the palace and outside. His attendants helped him to conceal the extent of his illness from the people, but he grew worse, and his physicians were unable to help him. He went to Smyrna to pray for relief from the affliction, but to no avail, and he returned to Nymphaeum although he did not go back to the palace. His tents were pitched in the imperial gardens, and here he died on 3 November in his sixty-second year.¹⁶ His reign had lasted thirty-three years, and he was the true renovator of the Byzantine state, the author of the Byzantine renaissance.

Vatatzes was succeeded by his son, Theodore II Lascaris (1254–1258), who is said to have suffered from the paternal epilepsy in a still more vehement form. Theodore was a brilliant, moody man, a student of the famous Nicephorus Blemmydes, who was also the master of the historian George Acropolites. Vatatzes' death was the signal for the young tsar of Bulgaria, Michael Asen, son of John Asen II and the grandson of Theodore Ducas, to invade Thrace and Macedonia to win back the territories which the late emperor had conquered, but had not had time to organize sufficiently for effective defense. From the region of Adrianople to Albania, Bulgarian arms reduced most of the cities, towns, and castles that had constituted the western part of Vatatzes' empire. The news caused consternation at the Nicene court.¹⁷

The scholarly Theodore Lascaris proved to be a good soldier, however, and, despite the divided counsels of his advisers, he decided upon a quick campaign. Leaving his trusted friend, the plebeian grand domestic George Muzalon, as regent of the empire in his absence, Theodore hastened to Adrianople, spent one day there, and on the next was marching westward through Thrace. A Bulgarian scout reported the emperor's remarkably swift advance to Michael Asen, then encamped near the river Maritsa.

Astonishment hindered belief, and the Bulgarian command decided not to move their camp until they could get more certain information. Theodore knew their location, however, and pressed on in a neurotic frenzy characteristic of him. When the foremost detachments of the Byzantine army struck the advance guard of the Bulgarian forces, they put many to the sword, and captured others, including the Bulgarian commander, but others fled in the darkness of night to the main encampment bringing excited news of the Byzantine attack. It was every man for himself, including Michael Asen. Some of the Bulgarians managed to find safety by fleeing into the forests, scratching their faces, Asen as well as the rest, in the thick undergrowth of the trees which concealed them, and others got away on unsaddled horses—"thus by running away the Bulgarians escaped the Roman sword, and at dawn when the emperor reached the site of their camp, and found their army gone, he was grieved, but there was nothing he could do about it." But in the following months of that memorable campaign of 1255, impeded though it sometimes was by bad weather, dysentery, and other hardships, Theodore Lascaris found much to assuage his initial disappointment. One after another he retook the cities, towns, and castles which Asen had seized, regaining all but two. One of these was a small stronghold in the hills of Ochrida, which was soon retaken by Alexius Ducas Philanthropenus, whom he left behind as military governor of the region of Ochrida, while the other was the important town of Tzepaena, an exceptionally strong fortress between the Balkan and Rhodope mountains, guarding the upper valley of the Maritsa. Despite occasional setbacks, over which he brooded excessively, Theodore Lascaris returned to Lampsacus in triumph at the end of the year, and after spending Christmas there he went on to Nymphaeum for the rest of the winter.¹⁸

When the spring came (1256), Theodore Lascaris recruited a huge army, taking on not only those already enrolled in the ranks but some who had never served before. He set out for Lampsacus and crossed the Hellespont to Europe, where he soon found that the Cuman allies of Michael Asen had pillaged widely in Thrace and Macedonia, and had defeated the forces which he had left the preceding year

¹⁶ Acropolites, 52, ed. Heisenberg, I, 101–3, who says ἀποπληξία γὰρ ἦν ἡ νόσος (p. 102, line 5), but medieval literary sources rarely describe an ailment with sufficient precision for a modern physician to identify it with accuracy. On the date of Vatatzes' death, see note 14 above and R. J. Loenertz, "La Chronique brève de 1352 . . . : Première partie, de 1205 à 1327," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXIX (1963), 332, 338–39.

¹⁷ Acropolites, 54, ed. Heisenberg, I, 107–9.

¹⁸ Acropolites, 55–60, *ibid.*, I, 109–24 (quotation on p. 112, ll. 12–16).

at Demotica. He tried to track them down, but they fled before him although he managed to kill a good many of them near Vizya (Bizye), northwest of Constantinople, after which he established his camp by the nearby river Rhagina (the modern Erkené), in eastern Thrace. Now Michael Asen, considering the size of Theodore's army and his dangerous proximity, expressed a desire for peace, sending to the imperial camp his father-in-law, the Russian prince Rostislav Mikhailovich, who had married the daughter of Bela IV of Hungary. Theodore received him graciously in May, 1256, and Rostislav swore to the terms he imposed: the town of Tzapaena was to be restored to Nicene rule (this was all that Michael Asen still held of Vatatzes' conquests), and henceforth both sides should be content with their former boundaries. Rostislav departed, loaded with gifts by the emperor, who intended to remain by the Rhagina until Michael Asen surrendered Tzapaena.¹⁹

The Emperor Theodore's victory over the Bulgarians dissuaded Michael II of Epirus from plotting against Nicaea with the Serbs and Albanians as he had begun to do. Actually Michael Asen rejected the terms set by Theodore, who was profoundly irritated, venting his anger on Acropolites, who had the misfortune to attract his attention just after he had learned of what he regarded as the Bulgarian's perfidy.²⁰ But whether Asen would give up Tzapaena peacefully or not, he had been defeated, and Bulgaria was soon torn by inter-

necine strife. Asen was killed by his cousin Koloman, who succeeded him for a little while, and was replaced on the throne by Constantine Tich (1257–1277), who put away his wife to marry the Emperor Theodore's daughter Irene, and was recognized as tsar by the imperial government.²¹ There was peace with Bulgaria, and the Nicene approach to Thessalonica would no longer be menaced.

In the meantime Michael of Epirus wanted to forestall any western venture that Theodore might plan with the large army he then had in Thrace, and so in the summer of 1256 he sent his wife, the devout Theodora, with their eldest son Nicephorus to arrange the young man's marriage with the emperor's daughter Maria, as Vatatzes had proposed in 1249. The marriage had been delayed by the war between Nicaea and Epirus (1251–1252), but the time now seemed appropriate for it to take place. Learning that Theodora and Nicephorus were coming to him, Theodore advanced to the Maritsa and met them. On the way to Thessalonica, where he had decided the ceremony should be performed, he explained to Theodora the price of union with the imperial family. The Epirotes must give up to him both Durazzo in Albania and Servia in northern Thessaly. It was unworthy of the emperor and unwise. Theodora, however reluctant, had no alternative but to give her sworn consent in writing, and since both she and her son were virtually hostages, Michael II had to accede to the ruinous stipulation.²² Theodora had hoped for peace between Nicaea and Epirus by this union of the Lascarids and the Ducae, but the marriage of Maria and Nicephorus in the fall of 1256 merely set the stage for another war between the eastern and western Greeks. This war was to involve the Latin states also, with disastrous consequences to the principality of Achaëa.

While in Thessalonica the Emperor Theodore Lascaris received a letter from officials in Bithynia to the effect that Michael Palaeologus, then governor of the region, had fled to the Turks. The emperor was irate, and could not

¹⁹ Acropolites, 61–62, *ibid.*, I, 124–27; Nic. Gregoras, III, 1, 3–4 (Bonn, I, 55–57); and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1833–34, pp. 26–27, with refs. to other sources. The “Russian prince” to whom Acropolites refers (ὁ Ῥώσος Οὐπος, *ibid.*, p. 127, l. 2, and thereafter simply as Οὐπος, which means “lord,” Magyar Úr, Hungarian princely title) was Rostislav Mikhailovich, whose career in this context is traced in Const. Jireček's review of N. Festa's *Theodori Ducae Lascaris epistulae CCXVII*, Florence, 1898, esp. pp. 279–82, in the *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XXI (Berlin, 1899), 622–26, and see G. Ostrogorsky, “Urum-Despotes: Die Anfänge der Despoteswürde in Byzanz,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLIV (1951), 455–56. Rostislav was the son of S. Michael Vsevolodovich, prince of Chernigov, who was executed by the Tatars in 1246. In his youth Rostislav ruled Novgorod, and later lived in Hungary as the son-in-law of King Bela IV, whose daughter Anna he had married. Becoming “ban of Slavonia” (*banus Slavonie*), he ruled Croatia, and later a small part of Serbia and an area in northern Bosnia. He died about 1262, shortly after his daughter Kunigunde became queen of Bohemia upon her marriage to Ottokar II Přemysl.

²⁰ Acropolites, 63, ed. Heisenberg, I, 127–32. Acropolites was lashed.

²¹ Acropolites, 73, *ibid.*, I, 152–53; Nic. Gregoras, III, 2, 4–5 (Bonn, I, 60–61), who names Theodore's daughter Theodora, apparently in error; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1843, p. 28; referring to her activities in later years, Pachymeres, *De Michaele Palaeologo*, III, 18 (Bonn, I, 210), calls her Irene.

²² Acropolites, 63, 64, ed. Heisenberg, I, 132–33, 134; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1840, p. 28; and cf. Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros* (1957), pp. 149–50, 159–60.

understand such strange conduct, but Acropolites reminded him that he had often threatened Palaeologus in fits of anger with the most terrible punishments, saying he would have him blinded; many people had heard these threats, Palaeologus had learned of them, and his flight was doubtless the consequence of fear. Palaeologus was well received by the sultan of Iconium, who put him in command of Christian forces which, according to Acropolites, distinguished themselves in helping to counter renewed Mongol attacks upon the Seljuk sultanate. However that may have been, the Mongols were overrunning the Moslem lands in Anatolia, and the emperor, disturbed by the news, returned home with the entire Byzantine army, assigning four commanders to his cities and strongholds in Macedonia,²³ and putting Acropolites in charge of them all with the title of praetor—"he did this in my opinion," the latter wrote in after years, "in order that by a long separation from him I might forget what I had suffered," for the emperor could see that Acropolites no longer felt free and easy in his presence, or perhaps, Acropolites also conceded, the emperor was simply tired of the objections that he made to his sometimes unjust decisions.²⁴

After the departure of the Emperor Theodore and the army from Thessalonica, Acropolites went to Berrhoea where in December, 1256, he is alleged to have turned back a papal embassy, headed by the bishop of Orvieto.²⁵ From

Berrhoea he began a three months' journey through the broad expanse of mountainous country which Theodore had placed under his jurisdiction, first going south to Servia, then north through Castoria and Ochrida, west to Elbasan (τὸ Ἰλβανόν) and Durazzo, where he spent eight days; thence he continued through the region of Croia (Χουναβία),²⁶ west over the Bad Rock and across the Black Drin to Dibra, Kičevo, and finally to the castle town of Prilep: "I had made the journey from Thessalonica to Prilep in three months in the winter time, for it was December when I left Berrhoea, and the end of February [1257] when I reached Prilep."²⁷

Pushing on now to Pelagonia, Acropolites learned that Constantine Chabaron, the military governor of Elbasan, had been caught in a trap set by the Despot Michael II of Epirus with the aid of his sister-in-law, Maria Petraliphas, with whom Constantine had fancied he was embarking upon a love affair. Acropolites sent orders to Michael Lascaris, the emperor's uncle and governor of Thessalonica, to come to Pelagonia where Xyleas, the commander of Prilep, also joined them. The three took counsel, and decided that Lascaris and Xyleas should hold Pelagonia and the plains of Monastir to prevent the Serbs from joining the Epirotes, for it was known that Stephen Uroš I (1242–1276) had made an alliance with Michael II. Acropolites himself went to Ochrida and thence advanced upon Elbasan, where he found that the Albanians were launched on a full-scale rebellion, manifesting a violent preference for the friendship of Epirus to the suzerainty of Nicaea. He managed to retreat into the rugged, well-fortified town of Prilep, which he thought was a safe haven, "but for me and for our people there it proved to be the contrary," for Michael II had been busy. Having seized all the villages and fortified places around Prilep, Michael laid siege to the town itself. Prilep had stout walls and was

²³ The Emperor Theodore appointed his uncle Michael Lascaris as governor of Thessalonica and certain other areas, with a small force of Paphlagonians and some three hundred Cumans under his command; put one Xyleas in charge of Prilep and the troops stationed there; made Theodore Calampaces commandant of Veles (*Belesas*, *Belessos*) on the Vardar; and set Constantine Chabaron over the town and district of Elbasan (*Albanon*, *Elbanon*) on the road to Durazzo—for these assignments, see Acropolites, 66, *ibid.*, I, 139. The translation of Acropolites in the Bonn Corpus (pp. 148 ff.) gives Xyleas the name Scuterius, which, however, denotes an office (*σκούτρίπος*, *σκούτρίον* [the imperial shield], Latin *scutarius*, lit. guardsman) and is not a proper name (cf. Codinus "Curopalates," *De officiis*, chaps. II, IV, V, VI, XVI [Bonn, pp. 11, 24, 39, 48, 82], on which work note K. Krumbacher, *Gesch. d. byzant. Literatur* [Munich, 1897, repr. New York, 1958], pp. 424–25, and see now the edition, with translation, of the late Jean Verpeaux, *Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des offices*, Paris, 1966, pp. 138, 162, 183, 196, 246, 301, 305, *et alibi*).

²⁴ Acropolites, 64–66, *ibid.*, I, 134–39; cf. Ephraem, vv. 9116–30 (Bonn, p. 365); Nic. Gregoras, III, 2, 1–3 (Bonn, I, 57–59); Pachymeres, I, 9–10 (Bonn, I, 24–26); Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), p. 135. On Michael's flight to the Turks, see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), pp. 28–30.

²⁵ Acropolites, 67, ed. Heisenberg, I, 139–40, but see below, p. 77a.

²⁶ On Albanian toponyms and related data in the Byzantine sources, cf. Ludwig v. Thallóczy and Const. Jireček, in the *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XXI (Berlin, 1899), 78 ff., who make the point that Croia is the center of the region of Albanon, as shown for example in a passage in Acropolites (chap. 49, Bonn, p. 98, line 24; ed. Heisenberg, I, 92, lines 1–2), but the town of Albanon is to be identified with Elbasan. Cf. G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–57, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, I (1856), 472–73 (notes), and cf. Antonio Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae," in *Studi veneziani*, VII (Florence, 1965–66), 264.

²⁷ Acropolites, 67, ed. Heisenberg, I, 140.

difficult to take, says Acropolites, but Michael placed his confidence in the treachery of the inhabitants.²⁸

During this period the Emperor Theodore had been occupied in Asia Minor with the sultan of Iconium, who "having the heart of a shy deer, as a poet would have said" (*ὁ φυζακινῆς ἐλάφου καρδίην ἔχων, εἶπεν ἄν ποιητῆς*), had fled from his country after the Mongols had defeated his army. Theodore gave him a temporary asylum on Nicene soil until he made peace with the invaders, to whom he subjected himself and agreed to pay tribute. At this time Michael Palaeologus, reassured as to his safety by an imperial oath, returned to Nicaea and recovered his property. Needing a bold and experienced commander to send against the despot of Epirus, the Emperor Theodore now chose Michael Palaeologus, who emerges from Acropolites' pages as a man of great ability. For whatever reason, perhaps not trusting that ability, Theodore gave him a small army recruited in Macedonia, almost useless and conspicuously unfit for its appointed task. Palaeologus was in no position to remonstrate. He accepted the command, apparently without comment, and marched through Thrace to Thessalonica and over the Vardar, "which the ancients call the Naxius," and joined forces with Michael Lascaris. Together they attacked the region of Berrhoea, not with any hope of taking the place, but to furnish their soldiers with an area to plunder, from which venture they collected a good many animals, presumably for both food and transport. But now Stephen Uroš, the kral of Serbia, whom Acropolites roundly denounces, sent a thousand Serbs to plunder the country around Prilep, whose commander, Xyleas, unwary and incompetent, says Acropolites, made a disorderly attack upon them, but was badly defeated and fled with the remnants of his troops to the hills for safety, "and so the army at Prilep was destroyed, and we were shut up in the town of Prilep, virtually imprisoned."²⁹

When Palaeologus and Michael Lascaris had finished pillaging the country around Berrhoea, they encamped near Vodena where their horses could graze in rich pastures. But Michael II of Epirus had learned by now of the small number and poor quality of Palaeologus's troops; he formed a superior cavalry force, selecting five hundred of his best men and putting them under

the command of his bastard son Theodore. The latter set out to make a surprise attack upon the Nicene camp near Vodena. On the way they met and routed a raiding party composed of some of the riffraff from the Nicene army. Fugitives from the rout brought news of the impending attack to Palaeologus, who now showed his bravery and skill in combat. Spear in hand, he took command of Michael Lascaris's special guard of fifty Paphlagonians, the only good soldiers in the Nicene army, and set out against the Epirotes. In such an emergency no help could be expected from Lascaris, who wore a corselet instead of a full breastplate so that he could flee the more readily when caught in a hard plight. Lascaris now cautiously watched from the sidelines the encounter in which the Paphlagonians under the inspired leadership of Palaeologus drove the picked Epirote cavalry into headlong flight, killing a good many of them. Young Theodore was slain, unrecognized, for Palaeologus did not know him by sight. After the victory Palaeologus and Lascaris were ordered to Prilep by Acropolites to confer on the situation, which remained almost as perilous as before. They arrived safely, but lacking sufficient forces to attack Michael of Epirus, they remained in Prilep only a few days, and then returned to the region of Vodena, leaving the faithful Acropolites to obey the emperor's orders by remaining in the threatened town, where the inhabitants knew no loyalty and the local soldiery could not be trusted.³⁰

Michael of Epirus promptly invested Prilep and set up siege tackle (*ἐλεπόλεις*) under the walls. Three times he tried to scale the walls in force, but was repulsed, and so withdrew to give his henchmen within the town an opportunity to do what his soldiers could not do. When part of the garrison ventured outside the walls to secure food, a group of Michael's sympathizers opened the gates, and Prilep was captured, "not by the valor of the enemy nor because of the weakness of the place, but by the stupidity and faithlessness of its defenders." The next morning Acropolites surrendered to Michael, who promised him freedom to return to imperial territory, and then calmly broke his word, sending the unhappy Acropolites in fetters from one place to another until he was finally imprisoned at Arta,³¹ "where he had ample leisure for meditating that literary revenge which colours

²⁸ Acropolites, 68, *ibid.*, I, 140-43.

²⁹ Acropolites, 70, *ibid.*, I, 144-46; cf. Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, I, 10 (Bonn, I, 26). The Nicenes had just lost Berrhoea (cf. p. 74b).

³⁰ Acropolites, 71, *ibid.*, I, 146-49.

³¹ Acropolites, 72, *ibid.*, I, 149-50.

his history of his own times."³² For the most part, of course, our knowledge of these events is confined to what Acropolites chose to tell us.

The Emperor Theodore Lascaris suspected Acropolites of treachery, unjustly but not entirely without reason, for he had learned of the defection of some of his best European commanders to Michael of Epirus. Xyleas, Manuel Ramatas, and one Poulachas were among those who preferred the rising to the setting sun, and threw in their lot with the conqueror. Isaac Nestongus surrendered Ochrida to the Epirotes, who took over many other towns and castles.³³ The Despot Michael now controlled most of western Macedonia. The high-strung emperor, easily given to distrust, seemed to have grounds for suspicion, and, according to Pachymeres, he ordered that Michael Palaeologus be re-arrested and returned to the court at Nicaea.³⁴

Having reacted to the Epirote victory with fear and a sense of frustration, the Emperor Theodore now directed the Patriarch Arsenius to place the whole despotate of Epirus under the ban of excommunication, an unwise move only likely to create schism in the Greek world and to result in the establishment of an independent Orthodox Church in the despotate. This would have been a very unfortunate development for Nicaea, which had been relieved of such ecclesiastical as well as political rivalry by Theodore Ducas's defeat at Klokotnitsa. If Michael of Epirus achieved much further success, he would probably adopt an independent ecclesiastical course and there was no need to push him in this direction. Owing to the intervention of Nicephorus Blemmydes, however, the decree of excommunication was withdrawn, and the patriarchate spared the possible ill effects of a sadly mistaken policy.³⁵

The Emperor Theodore Lascaris died in August, 1258, after a lengthy illness had driven him into repentance for the past and acceptance of the monastic garb. His body was buried in the monastery of Sosandri at Magnesia, where Vatatzes had been laid to rest before him. One of his daughters, Irene, had just married

Constantine Tich, the new Bulgarian tsar; and another, Maria, had married Michael Ducas's son Nicephorus, but Maria was also dead by now. Two other daughters, Theodora and Eudocia, were still unmarried. The emperor's only son, John IV, barely eight years old, succeeded him, but by the terms of his father's will John was placed under the guardianship of George Muzalon, the grand chamberlain (*protovestiaros*), who was made regent of the empire with full powers until John should reach his majority. Among others, the chief members of the aristocracy, always at odds with Theodore Lascaris, had sworn to uphold his political testament, and when he died they repeated their oaths. But nine days after the emperor's death, and three days after his burial, there gathered at the monastery of Sosandri a large assembly of nobles, upon a number of whom Theodore had inflicted savage injuries. While George Muzalon was attending with his two brothers a final funerary service being held for Theodore in the monastery, a large crowd, including nobles and Latin mercenaries, burst in upon him. Aided by fellow conspirators in the Muzalons' own party, they killed all three brothers as the protovestiarus George embraced the holy table of the sanctuary.³⁶

The assassination of George Muzalon brought to an end the late Emperor Theodore's plans for the regency after his death. Now all eyes turned toward Michael Palaeologus, says Acropolites, who relates that the church, the senate, and the army acquiesced in his assumption of power. During the last few months of 1258 Michael quickly took into his own hands the reins of government first as grand duke, then as despot, and finally as co-emperor with the young John IV, whose interests the Patriarch Arsenius made him swear to preserve.³⁷

³² Acropolites, 74–75, *ibid.*, I, 153–56; Nic. Gregoras, III, 3, 1–5 (Bonn, I, 62–66). Pachymeres, I, 19 (Bonn, I, 55–62), describing the death of George Muzalon at length and with tedious rhetoric, says that he was slain by a Latin named Charles (*ibid.*, p. 61: *Κάρονλος τις*), on which cf. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), pp. 39–41.

³⁷ Acropolites, 76–77, *ibid.*, I, 156–59, and especially Nic. Gregoras, IV, 1 (Bonn, I, 78–79), who says that Michael was raised on the imperial shield on 1 December, 1258, and crowned by the reluctant Patriarch Arsenius a month later, probably on Christmas day (cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, p. 30). Pachymeres, I, 29, and II, 4 (Bonn, I, 81 and 96), says that Michael was first crowned emperor on 1 January, 1259 (see V. Laurent, in *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVI [1937], 166–68). Actually there seems to be no way of establishing the exact date of Michael VIII's first coronation (he was crowned

³³ Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, p. 109.

³⁴ Acropolites, 72, *ibid.*, I, 151.

³⁵ Pachymeres, I, 11 (Bonn, I, 27).

³⁶ Nic. Blemmydes, *Curriculum vitae et carmina*, ed. Aug. Heisenberg, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 45–47; cf. Alice Gardner, *Lascaris of Nicaea*, London, 1912, p. 209. On Blemmydes, note Louis Bréhier, in *Dictionn. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclésiastiques*, IX (Paris, 1937), 178–82.

After his two successful Bulgarian campaigns (1255–1256), Theodore II Lascaris had apparently seen no need of making extreme concessions to the papacy to secure Constantinople, whose feeble Latin government seemed in no position to resist his occupation of the city when he should be able to undertake it in force. To be sure, as he prepared for the second Bulgarian campaign, Theodore had made overtures to the new pope, Alexander IV, to resume the negotiations which his father had carried on with Innocent, and Alexander had promptly sent the Dominican Constantine, bishop of Orvieto, an able administrator and a scholar, to confer with the emperor, who (we are usually informed) refused to receive him, and directed the historian Acropolites to send him back home after he had reached Berrhoea in Macedonia.³⁸ Actually, however, both the Emperor Theodore and the Patriarch Arsenius appear to have received Constantine and the other members of his mission with full honors. Theodore was then at Thessalonica (in the late fall of 1256). Nothing came of these *pourparlers*, to be sure; the problems could not be solved; but the failure was not due, as commonly alleged (by misunderstanding Acropolites' text), directly to the emperor's refusal to receive Constantine, which would have been a diplomatic discourtesy with neither point nor purpose.³⁹ There were advocates of church union both at the court of Nicaea and at the Curia Romana. Yielding the *filioque* clause to the Greeks was not as much of a stumbling block as surrendering Constantinople to them. The family of Courtenay possessed the Latin imperial throne by the right of conquest. They had dispossessed schismatics.

again after the recovery of Constantinople in 1261), and the matter is of little importance (cf. Geo. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, p. 397, note 2), but Laurent advances cogent reasons for following Pachymeres and accepting 1 January, 1259. On Michael's usurpation of the throne, see Michael Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile . . . (1204–1261)*, Oxford, 1975, pp. 80–93.

³⁸ Acropolites, 67, *ibid.*, I, 139–40; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1835–36; and see especially F. Schillmann, "Alexander IV," *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXII (1908), 108–31, where a dozen documents are published relating to Constantine of Orvieto's embassy in 1256. Cf. [Guglielmo della Valle], *Storia del duomo di Orvieto*, Rome, 1791, pp. 29, 31; Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz* (1903, repr. 1958), pp. 378–80, who by a slip of the pen refers to Constantine as the 'Bischof von Civitavecchia' (p. 379); and A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, Wisc., 1952, pp. 544–45.

³⁹ Cf. V. Laurent, "Le Pape Alexandre IV (1254–1261) et l'empire de Nicée," *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIV (1935), esp. pp. 42 ff.

On what juridical bases was the papacy to deprive them of that throne? The formal union of the Churches would have to await another time and other circumstances.

After Theodore's death in 1258 and Michael Palaeologus's gradual usurpation of imperial power in the weeks that followed, while Michael II of Epirus was organizing with Manfred of Sicily and William of Achaia the anti-Nicene coalition in Greece, Palaeologus is said to have sent another embassy to Alexander IV, but the pope may have seen no point in trying to take advantage of Nicene difficulties, probably assuming that political opportunism did not supply a sound basis for religious union.⁴⁰ To the background of this coalition we must now direct our attention. Michael Palaeologus dealt with his enemies without papal assistance, and his success had the most grievous results for the Frankish states in Greece, where the dominant figure, and the one who suffered most from the events, was William of Villehardouin.

Prince William of Achaia was one of the greater soldiers and less fortunate diplomats of his age. Until 1255 his performance had seemed to justify his self-confidence. He was rich, his realm was prosperous, but now he interfered in the affairs of Negroponte and the Athenian lordship, and soon became caught up in the contest between Epirus and Nicaea. From these involvements he was to learn hardship and defeat.

"In the midst of this prosperity," writes Sanudo in his history of the realm of Romania,

a misfortune occurred which much disturbed it [all]. The lady wife [Carintana dalle Carceri] of one of the triarchs of Negroponte died, and she was the heiress of this seignory. And because, as was divulged,

⁴⁰ That Michael VIII sent such an embassy at least appears from a statement in the letter which the Byzantine rhetorician Manuel Holobolus wrote for him about April, 1265. The letter is addressed to Pope Clement IV, and is published in N. Festa, "Lettera inedita dell'Imperatore Michele VIII Paleologo al Pontefice Clemente IV," in *Bessarione*, ann. IV, vol. 6 (1899–1900), esp. p. 48, and "Ancora la lettera di Michele Paleologo a Clemente IV," *ibid.*, pp. 530, 532. Festa misdates this letter 1267 (see below, Chapter 5, note 71). Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 1864 and 1942. Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, p. 383, thinks that "a greater pope in Alexander IV's position would not have let this unique opportunity slip by to win over the Greeks, but Alexander IV, the incompetent politician, lost the chance," a view which Vasiliev, *Hist. Byz. Emp.*, p. 545, echoes from Norden.

the aforesaid triarchs had made an agreement among themselves that, any one of them dying without heirs, the other two should get the succession, Messer Guglielmo da Verona and his son-in-law Narzotto dalle Carceri, the remaining triarchs, now pressed their case with the lord of Oreos, owing to the said lady's death. Those who claimed the succession to that "third" [a certain Leone dalle Carceri and his children] lodged a complaint with Prince William, who rode out straightway . . . and sent to tell the said triarchs to come to him, and when they did, they were detained by his command and put in prison.

Their wives, namely milady Simona, Messer Guglielmo's wife and the prince's niece, and milady Felisa, [Guglielmo's] daughter, Messer Narzotto's wife, and many other knights of their blood with tears, disheveled hair, and rent clothing came to Messer Paolo Gradenigo, then bailie of the Venetians in Negroponte [1254–1256], and begged him to set aright their sad misfortunes. Messer Paolo, moved by compassion, gathered his Venetians; they attacked the city of Negroponte with arms; and he took possession of it, freeing it from the prince's yoke. . . . When the prince learned of the loss of Negroponte, he sent there forthwith the lord of Karytaina [Geoffrey of Briel] with a large force. He laid waste the whole area of the island, and recovered the place, and the Venetians took refuge here and there as best they could, and fared badly. . . .⁴¹

Carintana dalle Carceri had held the northern "third" of Negroponte with the fortress town of Oreos. She comes to life in the pages of Frankish history only on the day she died, for her death caused the war of the Euboeote succession. If William of Villehardouin really imprisoned her fellow triarchs, as Sanudo states, they must have soon gained their freedom, for on 14 June, 1256, they made a pact with Marco Gradenigo, the new bailie of Negroponte (1256–1258). They had foregathered with Gradenigo at Thebes, the usual residence of Guy I de la Roche, the lord of Athens. And Narzotto dalle Carceri and Guglielmo da Verona now declared themselves

to be the *fideles homines ligii* henceforth and forever of the doge and commune of Venice. Obviously they disavowed their vassalage to the prince of Achaea, who had acquired suzerainty over Negroponte some years before from the powerless Latin Emperor Baldwin II. Narzotto and Guglielmo agreed that the *castrum pontis* by the sea, which guarded the "black bridge" connecting Euboea with the mainland, should be held by the Venetians, who might do with it what they chose. The triarchs ceded all right to customs revenues (*comerclium*) to the Venetians, who gave up the annual tribute (Narzotto at least was paying 700 hyperperi a year), which was due to the Republic under the terms of the "old pact." The triarchs' properties and subjects were to remain free "in the same state as they were when we sought possession of Oreos." In Negroponte itself the Venetians acquired extensive properties in fee simple (*burgessiae*), extending from the channel and the castle by the bridge all the way to the Church of S. Mary of the Crutched Friars and the house of Othon de Cicon, the lord of Carystus. Although the triarchs preserved a right of way (*via aperta*) from their own holdings to the bridge, it was quite apparent that (if and when this pact could be put into effect) the Venetians had finally acquired an extensive and a true quarter in Negroponte,⁴² a fragment of Venice overseas. This of course did come to pass, and it was a new development, one destined to be of the highest importance to the Venetians, who in 1390 finally acquired dominion over the entire island, which they held until 1470, when another chapter of their history was written in the blue waters of the Aegean.

Narzotto and Guglielmo would continue to send to Venice, presumably every year, the honorific cloths of gold, one for the doge and another for the altar of the ducal Church of S. Mark. Three times a year they would have the

⁴¹ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 103–4; R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280: Regestes et documents," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), nos. 41–44, pp. 248–49. Carintana's husband, whose name is unknown, was apparently excluded from succession to the northern third of the island. He sided with Prince William (Sanudo, ed. Hopf, p. 104): "Il principe per ricuperar la città mandò sopra l'isola quanta gente potè metter ad uno e della Morea e del terzo del Rio [Oreos], che teniva in se" (unless conceivably Sanudo is here referring to Leone dalle Carceri). Loenertz, *op. cit.*, has corrected various errors in Hopf's article in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 274–75, 277–80, 284a, 285–86 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 208–9, 211–14, 218a, 219–20), which had become the standard account.

⁴² Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III (1857), 13–14, a letter patent of Narzotto dated at Thebes on 14 June, 1256; Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 45–46, pp. 249–50. According to the Venetian *Liber Albus*, fol. 96^v, "simile pactum habemus cum domino Guilelmo" (*cf.* Loenertz, *loc. cit.*), which is not recorded in Tafel and Thomas, *Der Doge Andreas Dandolo und die von demselben angelegten Urkundensammlungen zur Staats- und Handelsgeschichte Venedigs, Mit den Original-Registern des Liber Albus, des Liber Blancus und der Libri Pactorum* . . . (from the *Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wissen.*, III. Cl., VIII. Bd., I. Abt.), Munich, 1855, p. 38. On the importance of the new "quarter" to Venice, note Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale* (1971), p. 191.

laudes sung to the doge and his successors as part of the liturgy at Christmas, Easter, and on the feast of S. Mark,⁴³ and they acknowledged the Venetians as possessing henceforth in perpetuity the right to regulate the weights, measures, and scales to be used throughout the island. The bailie wrung the last advantage out of them, and Narzotto at least agreed to provide funds enough to support two prebendaries at S. Mark's. The persons and properties of all Venetians were of course to be secure, "going, staying, and returning without exaction." Finally, Narzotto and Guglielmo would make all their vassals and subjects swear to abide by this convention: "likewise we promise to wage a lively war against the prince of Achaea and his supporters, by ourselves and through our heirs in perpetuity[!], and we shall not make peace with him or them, nor a truce, accord, pact or any other convention without your permission and command. . . ."⁴⁴

The Venetians were active in Italy as well as in Greece. In times of crisis they sought to secure past gains as well as to make new ones. At the behest of the Venetian patriarch of Grado, Pope Alexander IV confirmed him in full jurisdiction over all the churches in Venetian-held territory in Romania as well as in the Veneto (on 11 and 14 July, 1256),⁴⁵ a declaration doubtless desired by the Venetian state. But if we can believe the chronicler-doge Andrea Dandolo, writing almost a century after these events, as grave discord arose between the Venetians and the prince of Achaea, Pope Alexander recognized the likely peril of the Greeks' gaining in strength against the Latins in Romania. He warned both sides "that in their zeal for the faith and in reverence for the Roman Church they should desist from the dangerous course on which they had embarked, so that he should not have reason to take stronger action against them."⁴⁶ His words had no effect.

On 2 October, 1256, the Doge Ranieri Zeno gave the bailie Marco Gradenigo full authority to conclude any sort of agreement with Guglielmo da Verona and Narzotto dalle Carceri, also of Verona, *dominatores in Nigroponte*,⁴⁷ and on the following 25 January the two triarchs issued further letters patent, pledging in alliance with the Venetians to wage "a lively war against the lord William of Villehardouin, prince of Achaea, and his supporters," and under no conditions to make a peace or truce with their opponent without the Republic's full agreement. Gradenigo promised that the doge would attach the ducal seal to the pact, and make all his successors as bailie swear on the gospels to abide by its provisions.⁴⁸

The bailie Marco Gradenigo had come to Greece with three galleys, according to Sanudo, and begun a thirteen months' siege of Negroponte. When he finally took the city, it was with the aid of the two chief members of the house of the de la Roche, Guy I, the lord of Athens, who held Argos and Nauplia as Prince William's vassal, and Guy's younger brother William, who was also the prince's vassal for his Moreote fief of Veligosti. Guy had probably joined Venice when Gradenigo made his pact with the triarchs in mid-June, 1256, and William had probably joined his brother soon thereafter. According to the *Chronicle of the Morea*, both Thomas II d'Autremencourt, lord of Salona (Amphissa), and Ubertino Pallavicini, the margrave of Boudonitza (Thermopylae), also entered the league being formed against Villehardouin.⁴⁹

Although at some point Venetian infantry, armed with pikes, broke a charge of the prince's cavalry in the fields outside the walls of Negroponte and saved the city from recapture by a Moreote force,⁵⁰ the war did not go well for

⁴⁷ Tafel and Thomas, III, 4, 9-10.

⁴⁸ Tafel and Thomas, III, 1-4, 7-9, where the documents are incorrectly dated 7 January, 1256, on which see Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 48-49, p. 251. Guglielmo da Verona also gave one of his sons as a hostage to the Venetians until the war with Prince William should end (T. and Th., III, 8). William de la Roche, lord of Veligosti, is named as a witness to the proceedings.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Chronicle of Morea* (Greek version), ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, vv. 3195-96, 3294-95, pp. 212, 218; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, Paris, 1911, par. 234, p. 85; *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes* (1873), p. 439, which is based on the Greek version. According to Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RiSS*, XII-1, 306, Marco Gradenigo appeared at Negroponte with seven galleys.

⁵⁰ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 104-5: The Venetians pulled the Frankish horsemen from

⁴³ On the practice, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958, esp. pp. 147-56.

⁴⁴ Tafel and Thomas, III, 14-16.

⁴⁵ Tafel and Thomas, III, 16-23; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874-75, nos. 16,468, 16,481 (vol. II, pp. 1350, 1351); and cf. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, in the new Muratori, *RiSS*, XII, pt. 1, fasc. 4 (Bologna, 1941), 305-6. The patriarch of Grado usually resided in Venice, where he was head of the church. The cathedral church of Venice was S. Pietro di Castello, which never cut any figure beside the ducal church of S. Mark's, whither the episcopal throne was finally transferred in 1807.

⁴⁶ Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RiSS*, XII-1, 306.

the allied forces, even when the doughty Geoffrey of Briel deserted the prince to throw in his lot with Guy de la Roche, the lord of Athens, whose daughter Geoffrey had married. But the Genoese aided Prince William, glad of a chance to strike at the Venetians, and Othon de Cicon, the lord of Carystus, "held with the prince," says Sanudo, "and Carystus was then in high repute." The war extended to the Morea, and was a lively one, as the allies intended, but about the end of May or early June, 1258, William defeated Guy de la Roche at the pass of Mount Karydi,⁵¹ on the old road from Megara to Thebes, whither the vanquished barons now fled to the refuge of the castle on the Cadmea. As Guy de la Roche and Geoffrey of Briel set about making amends to the irate prince, the Euboeote allies reconsidered their position. On Wednesday, 6 August, 1258, at a meeting in the Venetian chancery at Negroponte Guglielmo da Verona and Narzotto dalle Carceri, at the request of the new bailie Andrea Barozzi, agreed to the doge's making judicious inquiries as to possible terms of peace with the victorious prince of Achaea.⁵²

The defeat at Mount Karydi must have been a severe jolt to Guy de la Roche's brother William, whose continuing adherence to the Euboeote cause was doubtless strengthened on 1 September, 1258, when the Doge Ranieri Zeno confirmed a grant which the enterprising bailie Marco Gradenigo had made (in January, 1257?) "to the noble William de la Roche, of 1,000 hyperperi of land conceded in our name and that of the commune of Venice as a fief to the said noble." William's enjoyment of his new

fief, which seems to have been somewhere around Oreos, clearly awaited the final outcome of the war with Prince William.⁵³ Actually the encounter at Mount Karydi had virtually ended the "war of the Euboeote succession," and sometime during the early months of 1259 the doge authorized a new bailie to negotiate a peace "with the illustrious William of Villehardouin, prince of Achaea and grand seneschal of the empire of Romania,"⁵⁴ as well as with his ally Leone dalle Carceri,⁵⁵ who seems thereafter to disappear from the documents. But owing to the tragedy soon to befall Prince William there was to be no opportunity to re-establish peace until 1262 when the triarchs returned to their Moreote allegiance, as "in the time of the lady Carintana," and Venice retained at least some of the advantages she had gained in Negroponte.⁵⁶

⁵¹ Tafel and Thomas, III, 29–31. The ducal confirmation of the earlier grant to William de la Roche was a chrysobull; the extant text is dated 1 September, 1259, the second indication (which however runs from 1 September, 1258, to 31 August, 1259); Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tierciars," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 51, 57, pp. 251, 253, has therefore corrected the date of the document. William's fief, yielding 1,000 hyperperi a year, is located in the text by reference to the *scala Laureti*, which Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale* (1971), p. 192, shrewdly identifies with the trading station at Oreos. By giving up his fief, William could end his homage to Venice under certain conditions (T. and Th., III, 31). Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 104, says that "the Signoria of Venice promised [William de la Roche] by an express pact that, if he lost the hereditary state which he had in Romania, [Venice] would give him every year 11,000 soldi de grossi."

⁵² Tafel and Thomas, III, 26.

⁵³ Tafel and Thomas, III, 27, and cf. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tierciars," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 60, 62, pp. 253, 254, and *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel* (1207–1390), Florence, 1975, pp. 429–35.

⁵⁴ Tafel and Thomas, III, 46–55, documents dated 5 January and 15–16 May, 1262, on which cf. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tierciars," *Byzantion*, XXXV, nos. 65–66a, pp. 254–55; Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 108–11. The Venetians lost the castle of Negroponte by the sea, which had to be torn down at the expense of the triarchs, to whom reverted the land, on which they could build small houses, but in the event the triarchs were prepared to sell the land (or any part thereof) to a non-resident of Negroponte, they had to give the Venetians a first refusal at the same price (T. and Th., III, 48, 54–55). The Venetians intended to stay in Negroponte, where they retained control throughout the island of weights and measures (*op. cit.*, pp. 48, 54) and above all of the customs, *totum comerchum maris*, saving the rights of the prince of Achaea, the triarchs, and certain others (pp. 47, 53–54). The Venetians increased the size of their quarter in the city, acquiring land and houses in fee simple in the area of the Church of S. Margarita, so that the Venetian quarter now extended from the seaside to the street (*callis*) which ran between the Dominican convent and the house of Aroldo da

their saddles with pikes (*rampigoni*), easily defeating them and taking many prisoners, whom they sent to Venice, "as I have heard from the prisoners themselves," says Sanudo, "with whom I have talked at Venice."

⁵⁵ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 105; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 230–35, pp. 84–85; *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 3282–3331, pp. 220–22; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 220–24, pp. 50–51. On Othon de Cicon, lord of Carystus from at least December, 1250, to 21 March, 1263, after which the sources reveal no further trace of him, see R. J. Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi . . .," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), 158–61. Othon de Cicon was a nephew of Othon de la Roche, the first Latin lord of Athens. Othon de Cicon appears to have married Agnese Ghisi, sister or half-sister of the island dynasts Geremia and Andrea Ghisi. After Othon's death (in 1264–1265?), Agnese became the "lady of Carystus."

⁵⁶ Tafel and Thomas, III, 5–6, 10–11; Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tierciars," *Byzantion*, XXXV, no. 54, p. 252. William de la Roche was a witness to these proceedings.

The death of the Emperor Theodore and the succession of a boy to the throne of Nicaea were welcome events to the Despot Michael II of Epirus, whose ambition grew wings as he thought of flying to the shores of the Bosphorus. Michael had occupied Vodena early in 1258, and now held all northern Greece west of the Vardar.⁵⁷ He was in an excellent position to launch an attack on Thessalonica, and (as Pachymeres notes) Michael certainly took his uncle Theodore, one-time emperor of Thessalonica, as his model, and became intoxicated with the determination to emulate and even to surpass his stirring conquests.⁵⁸ Everything had not gone as Michael might have wished, however, for though he scored victories over the Nicenes, and though the Emperor Theodore, brooding over the setbacks his forces had suffered, removed Michael Palaeologus from the command in Greece and recalled him to imprisonment, a startling development on the despot's own western shores threatened to cut short his career of conquest. In 1257–1258 Manfred, prince of Taranto, soon to become king of Sicily and southern Italy (in August, 1258), seems to have taken advantage of Michael's full preoccupation with the struggle against Nicaea, and seized much of the Albanian-Epirote coast from Durazzo inland to Berat, thence to Avlona on a protected inlet of the Adriatic, and south to Butrinto opposite the important island of Corfu, which he also occupied.⁵⁹ This was a severe blow to the "despo-

tate," but with the resilience of a born politician Michael managed to follow the principle of joining with an enemy who cannot be defeated. He offered Manfred his beautiful young daughter Helena in marriage, and apparently proposed as her dowry the towns of Durazzo, Berat, Avlona, and Butrinto, the region of Sphenaritzia at the mouth of the Voyusa River, and the island of Corfu, all of which was quite acceptable to Manfred, whose wife had died in January, 1258, and who already held these places, over which he now set his bold admiral Philippe Chinard, a Frankish native of Cyprus, investing him with the island of Corfu.⁶⁰ Chinard is said to have been sent with a large fleet in June, 1258, "to Romania . . . and the province of Macedonia" to aid Michael against the Nicenes.⁶¹ About a year later Manfred is

Byzantine Restoration: The Battle of Pelagonia (1259)," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII (1953), 103, and *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), pp. 49–51. (Manfred was crowned king of Sicily at Palermo on 10 August, 1258.)

⁵⁹ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 107, and cf. genealog. table on p. 529: ". . . Rè Manfredi di Puglia e Scicilia, a cui avea dato in dote Durazzo e la Val-lona e Corfù, el qual Corfù Manfredi diede a Miser Filippo Zonardo [Chinardo] suo ammiraglio, ch'era nativo di Cipri." Corfu and Butrinto are not mentioned in the notarial record of 23 February, 1258 (see preceding note), and were therefore acquired, presumably, after this date. For the marriage, see in general Acropolites, 76, *ibid.*, I, 157–58; Pachymeres, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 82–83); and Nic. Gregoras, III, 5 (Bonn, I, 71–72); and cf. Thallóczy, Jireček, and Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata*, I, no. 245, p. 71. On Helena, whose life ended in tragedy (in 1271), see Dendias, "Helene Angelina Doukaina . . .," *Epeirōtika Chronika*, I (1926), 219–94; Giuseppe del Giudice, "La Famiglia di Re Manfredi," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, III (1878), 3 ff., 19, 35 ff., 53 ff.; IV (1879), 46–97, 299–334; V (1880), 21 ff., 76, and cf. pp. 470 ff.; and the old work, based upon documents from the Angevin archives in Naples and other hitherto unpublished texts, of Domenico Forges Davanzati, *Dissertazione sulla seconda moglie del Re Manfredi e su'loro figliuoli*, Naples, 1791, although Julius Ficker, "Manfreds zweite Heirat und der Anonymus von Trani," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, III (1882), 358–68, accuses Davanzati (perhaps unjustly) of forging the relevant chronicle known as the *Anonymus Tranensis*.

⁶¹ F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, VI (Venice, 1720), 774–76; B. Capasso, *Historia diplomatica regni Siciliae*, Naples, 1874, pp. 145–46; del Giudice, in *Arch. storico per le province napoletane*, III, 30; Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, p. 331; Dendias, in *Epeirōtika Chronika*, I (1926), 245. It may have been at this time that Manfred took Corfu and Butrinto, as Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros* (1957), p. 167, suggests, although Geanakoplos, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII, 105 and note 18, believes that Michael added them as part of Helena's dowry to supply a further inducement to Manfred to assist him in the conquest of Thessalonica and Constantinople. The latter part of the *Translatio S. Thomae Apostoli*, relating to

Milano, and as far as the property of Sivino da Caristo (pp. 47–48, 54). Grapella dalle Carceri, Leone's heir, apparently succeeded to Oreos (or to part of the fief), and figures in the peace as one of three triarchs, *Guilielmus de Verona et Crapella de Carceribus Verone et Narzotus de Carceribus Verone, dominatores insule Nigropontis* (p. 46).

⁵⁷ Cf. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 76, ed. Heisenberg, I, 157, 11. 14–19.

⁵⁸ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 82–83), who says that Michael aimed at Constantinople and the imperial throne. Cf. Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz* (1903, repr. 1958), p. 332.

⁵⁹ By February, 1258, Manfred had possession of Durazzo, Berat (Belegrada), Avlona, the hills of Sphenaritzia (at the mouth of the Voyusa River), and the surrounding territories, as appears from a deed of sale (for half a vineyard) drafted by a notary of Durazzo on the twenty-third of the month (F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata res graecas italicque illustrantia*, III [Vienna, 1865], 239–42; L. de Thallóczy, Const. Jireček, and Em. de Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, I [Vienna, 1913], no. 246, pp. 71–72, on which see M. A. Dendias, "Helene Angelina Doukaina, queen of Sicily and Naples" (in Greek), *Ἡπειρωτικὰ Χρονικά*, I (1926), 223–27, 234–35, and cf. D. J. Geanakoplos, "Greco-Latin Relations on the Eve of the

said to have received Helena with all solemnity at Trani (on 2 June, 1259),⁶² when Michael badly needed a strong ally, as events were to prove. In the meantime, however, he was playing against Nicaea for high stakes, and he may have thought the price was not too great for such a son-in-law. Some day a grandson of his might occupy the throne of Sicily and southern Italy; besides somehow, sometime he might contrive to recover the possessions he had been obliged to relinquish. For Manfred, on the other hand, his father-in-law's acquisition of the imperial crown of Constantinople at the expense of the Latin Emperor Baldwin II, whom the papacy was supporting, was doubtless a consummation devoutly to be wished, especially when it was to be accompanied by the extension of his own south Italian territories to the eastern shores of the Adriatic. As Michael moved farther eastward, so would Manfred, who now issued coins with the legend *Manfridus R. Siciliae . . . et Dominus Romaniae*.⁶³

In the meantime the Despot Michael II had already secured another powerful ally, and one more closely connected with the affairs of Greece, by the marriage of another daughter, Anna, to William of Villehardouin, prince of Achaëa. This marriage soon involved William in another war, catching him up this time in the bitter contest between Epirus and Nicaea, but, quite understandably, he found the Despot

Michael's proposal too attractive to refuse. William was offered and accepted a dowry of 60,000 hyperperi as well as costly gifts,⁶⁴ together with the castle town of Liconia and other lands in southern Thessaly.⁶⁵ Liconia, southeast of Demetrias on the Gulf of Volos, was valuable to William because of its proximity to the northern Euboeote "third" of Oreos, over which he claimed of course the feudal right of suzerainty. Liconia was in itself an important place, for just twenty years before it had been declared worth 10,000 hyperperi a year in a suit brought before the Curia Romana.⁶⁶ No time was lost in arranging the marriage, which took place at Patras in the late summer of 1258. William must have been well pleased, for according to the popular Greek chronicle attributed to Dorotheus, seventeenth-century archbishop of Monemvasia, Anna was quite as lovely as her sister, "a second Helen of Menelaus" (ὡς δευτέρα Ἑλένη τοῦ Μενελάου).⁶⁷ Quite appropriately she took up residence in the new castle on the rugged hillside of Mistra close to ancient Sparta and the banks of the Eurotas where the first Helen had lived before her. Upon her marriage Anna took the name of Agnes. Like her sister, she witnessed great events.

Chinard's alleged removal of the relics of the Apostle Thomas from "Edessa" (Vodena) to Ortona in Italy, has been declared a monastic invention by Fedor Schneider, "Eine Quelle für Manfreds Orientpolitik," *Quellen und Forschungen*, XXIV (Rome, 1932-33), 112-23, who would also throw doubt, perhaps improperly, upon the historicity of the whole expedition to Epirus. On Chinard, see E. Bertaux, "Les Français d'outre-mer en Apulie et en Épire au temps des Hohenstaufen d'Italie," *Revue historique*, LXXXV (1904), 233-51. Chinard was a French Cypriote of wide experience in the Holy Land, a devoted follower of the Emperor Frederick II, to whom he owed grants of extensive lands in Italy. Count of Conversano and grand admiral of the kingdom of Sicily, Chinard died lord of Corfu. Abhorred by the papacy, which refused after his death to lift the bans laid upon his sons, he was *excommunicatissimus quondam Philippus Chinardus* (Édouard Jordan, ed., *Les Registres de Clément IV* [1265-1268], Paris, 1894-1945, no. 1131, p. 392, from a letter to Charles of Anjou dated at Viterbo on 1 October, 1266).

⁶² *Anonymus Tranensis*, ed. Forges Davanzati, *Dissertazione*, pp. 11 ff.; del Giudice, in *Arch. stor. per le prov. napoletane*, III, 18, 54-55; Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros*, pp. 177-78; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 50-52; and cf. the objections of Ficker, *Mitt. d. Inst. f. oesterreich. Geschichtsforschung*, III (1882), 362 ff.

⁶³ G. Valenti, "Vestigia di Manfredi di Hohenstaufen Re di Sicilia e Signore di 'Romania,'" in *Numismatica*, 1939, p. 65.

⁶⁴ See the *Greek Chronicle of the Morea*, ed. P. P. Kalonaros, Athens, 1940, vv. 3127-32, p. 134, and cf. *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon (1911), par. 216, pp. 77-78. On the marriages of the Despot Michael's daughters, note again Pachymeres, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 82-83).

⁶⁵ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 107: ". . . e li diede per dote il castello della Liconia e alcune altre terre."

⁶⁶ Sp. P. Lampros, *Eggrapha* (Athens, 1906), pt. 1, doc. 26, p. 42; Lucien Auvray, ed., *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (Paris, 1907), no. 4390, col. 1046, doc. dated 26 May, 1238: ". . . ac fructus perceptos ex eis [i.e. casale Liconiae cum pertinentiis suis] quos decem milia ypperpera extimabat. . . ." A. L. Tăutu, ed., *Acta Honorii III (1216-1227) et Gregorii IX (1227-1241)*, Città del Vaticano, 1950, does not give the text of this letter. Since 1235 the Cistercian abbey of Daphni had claimed the right to possession of Liconia in a suit brought against one Albertus "Bokaron," or Boccerannus, *miles Nigripontensis diocesis* (Auvray, II, no. 2671, cols. 108-9, and cf. nos. 3214, 3583). In 1240 the case was decided in favor of the abbot and convent of Daphni, against the claims of two daughters of the now deceased Albertus (*ibid.*, III [1908], no. 5204, cols. 256-57), but that was not the end of the litigation (III, no. 6085).

⁶⁷ Dorotheus, in J. A. C. Buchon, *Chroniques étrangères relatives aux expéditions françaises pendant le XIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1841, p. xxxv. The Chronicles of the Morea represent the marriage of William and Anna as arranged by the latter's brother, the Despot Nicephorus, after the death of their father Michael II (the *Greek Chronicle*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3093-3132, 3469-72; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 211-16, 255; and cf. *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 245-49, and *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron.*

According to the garbled account in the *Chronicles of the Morea*, Michael II and William of Villehardouin met in a festive parliament at Patras about December, 1258, to plan the campaign which was to drive the Nicenes from Greece and Macedonia. After the expected victory Michael was to take over Thessaly (Vlachia), or so it is said, and William was to revive the erstwhile Latin kingdom of Thessalonica.⁶⁸ Upon returning home, Michael informed King Manfred of the plans that had been made and requested assistance to help carry them out. William in his turn served notice of a feudal levy upon his vassals—Othon de la Roche, bailie of the Athenian duchy (1258–1260) during the absence of his elder brother Guy in France; the triarchs of Negroponte; Duke Angelo Sanudo of the Archipelago (Naxos); the Margrave Ubertino Pallavicini of Boudonitz; and the barons and knights of the Megarid.⁶⁹ They were all to be prepared by early spring to take the field with William against the Nicenes, *pour chevauchier contre ses anemis avec lui*.

The formation of the coalition was well known in Constantinople and Nicaea, where the Latin and Greek rulers each tried to assess its likely effect upon his state. If the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus was in grave danger, so too was the Latin Emperor Baldwin. The ambition of Michael of Epirus to rule in Constantinople was no secret, and his ally Manfred had inherited his father Frederick II's enmity to the Latin empire as well as his contest

with the papacy, Baldwin's chief support in Europe. If the coalition succeeded in taking Thessalonica, the road would lie pretty much open to Constantinople, which Michael of Epirus and the forces of Manfred might well put under siege while they tried to hold the Emperor Michael VIII at bay, and if they could thus reach Constantinople, Michael VIII would presumably make the Bosphorus his first line of defense for the preservation of Nicaea. Baldwin may have entertained as great a hope as Michael VIII that the coalition would break up, but Baldwin was a negligible figure with almost no possessions except his capital. The Villehardouin had been traditionally loyal to the Latin empire, and the coalition had of course been formed primarily against Nicaea. Baldwin and the Latin barons in Constantinople therefore decided to do a little fishing in the troubled waters. It was conceivable that they might gain something; it was certain that they had little to lose. They decided to send an embassy to Michael VIII shortly after his accession.

If we can accept the account of Acropolites, Michael VIII received the envoys courteously, but with obvious amusement, rejecting their successive requests that the Nicene government cede to the Latin regime in Constantinople the city of Thessalonica and the territory to the east of it all the way to the Bosphorus, and when he refused, they wanted Serres and the lands to the east thereof, to which suggestion he returned a second refusal. "The envoys readily jumped from place to place," says Acropolites; "and since they had nothing, if they got anything at all, they might rejoice in it as profit." They asked for the territory from Voleron to Constantinople, which Michael pleasantly refused. "What then are you going to give us?" the Latins asked Michael, who replied, "I am going to give you — nothing." He offered them peace, however, and added: "I want the Latins in Constantinople to pay to the Roman empire one half their customs duties and the same proportion of their income from receipts in gold. If you would promise to yield these to me, I am ready for peace. If not there shall be war. . . ." The Latin embassy had been to no purpose, and the envoys returned to Constantinople,⁷⁰ some of them probably re-

gr.-rom., pp. 438, 440), a confusion of time and persons also to be found in Dorotheus, *loc. cit.*, whose chief source was the Greek *Chronicle*. The chronology of the marriages of the Epirote princesses causes some difficulty. Dendias, in *Epeirotika Chronika*, I (1926), 243–44, believes that two references in Acropolites (chap. 76, ed. Heisenberg, I, 157–58, and chap. 79, p. 164, II, 3–6) show that the marriage of Helena and Manfred preceded that of Anna and Villehardouin, but I do not get this impression from these texts. The betrothal of Helena and Manfred preceded the marriage of her sister with Villehardouin, but Helena's actual wedding was delayed a year, and in the meantime Anna had married Villehardouin, probably late in the summer of 1258.

⁶⁸ Cf. the *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, par. 250, pp. 55–56: ". . . et con la gracia de Dios auremos victoria et recobraremos toda la Blaquia et el realme de Salonich; et yo aure la Blaquia, et vos auredes el realme de Salonich."

⁶⁹ Greek *Chronicle of the Morea*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3480–3520; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 256–62. The *Chronicles* state that the campaign was to be directed against the "lord Theodore of Vlachia," i.e. John Ducas of Neopatras, the illegitimate son of Michael II by his mistress Gangrené, but John was actually on his father's side in opposition to the Nicenes: John Ducas's younger brother was named Theodore.

⁷⁰ Acropolites, 78, ed. Heisenberg, I, 161–63. Voleron appears to be a district east of the Nestus river (K. Amantos, in *Hellenika*, II [1929], 124–26). Cf. H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 328–29, and K. M. Setton *et al.*, eds.,

calling the parable that "unto every one that hath shall be given, . . . but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away."

Michael VIII himself sent an embassy to the Despot Michael II of Epirus under Theodore Philes, one of the many nobles whom the late Theodore Lascaris had blinded. The tone of Philes' instructions was conciliatory, for Michael VIII wished to secure the release of Constantine Chabaron and George Acropolites and to reach a peaceful accommodation with the despot, who gave the envoy a rude reception, however, obviously confiding his future to the strength of his new sons-in-law. Michael also sent an imperial secretary (ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου), Nicephorus Alyates, to King Manfred, who de-

tained him for almost two years, and a third envoy was sent to William of Achaëa. Manfred and William were no more to be dealt with than their ambitious father-in-law.⁷¹ Michael VIII dispatched a fourth embassy, this time to Pope Alexander IV, ostensibly to discuss the union of the Churches, but undoubtedly to secure papal condemnation of the triple alliance and obstruction of the allies' projected movement against Nicaea.⁷² All Michael VIII's efforts had been in vain, and now he had no alternative but war against the western allies who wished to despoil him of his lands in Europe and probably try to deprive him of the throne.

⁷¹ *A History of the Crusades*, II (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 152, map 6; in the revision of the maps for the 2nd ed. (Madison, Wisc., 1969) this name was unaccountably displaced eastward.

⁷² Acropolites, 79, *ibid.*, I, 163-65.

⁷³ For Michael VIII's embassy to the pope about the beginning of the year 1259, see above, p. 77b, and *cf.* Geanakoplos, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII, 118-20, and *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 60-62.

5. PELAGONIA, THE LOSS OF CONSTANTINOPLE, AND THE RISE OF THE ANGEVINS (1259–1268)

ONE of Michael's first important acts, after his establishment as regent and before his accession to the throne, was to send his brother John Palaeologus, whom he had made grand domestic, into Greece with an army for the defense of imperial territory in the west, especially Thessalonica, against the designs of the Despot Michael II Ducas of Epirus. John was accompanied by Alexius Strategopoulus, John Raoul, and other experienced campaigners. As the army marched westward, it was reinforced by local units along the way. Proclaimed emperor, Michael Palaeologus later raised his brother to the dignity of Sebastocrator and sent the insignia of office to his camp in Macedonia. Strategopoulus was then appointed grand domestic.¹ Palaeologus, Strategopoulus, and Raoul soon met with a setback when John Ducas, bastard son of the Despot Michael and lord of Neopatras in southern Thessaly, stopped the imperial army's advance at Berrhoea with a large force of Vlachs,² but the expedition was to achieve within the coming year one of the greatest military victories ever won by Greek arms in the long history of the Palaeologian era.

The Emperor Michael VIII needed more troops to join the army in Macedonia under John Palaeologus and Alexius Strategopoulus, and looked for mercenaries in Germany, Hungary, Serbia, and Anatolia. According to the *Chronicles of the Morea*, his appeals brought three hundred knights from Germany, allegedly under the duke of Carinthia. A cavalry force of fifteen hundred came from Hungary. Whatever the relation of the Serbian ruler Stephen Uroš to the triple alliance of Epirus, Achaëa, and Sicily, the *Chronicles* represent him as sending six hundred mounted men. A contingent is also stated to have come from Bulgaria. Five hundred Turks and two thousand Cumans are

said to have answered Michael VIII's call for men-at-arms.³ In March, 1259, these auxiliary forces assembled in the plains near Adrianople for a general muster before being sent on to the Sebastocrator John Palaeologus in Macedonia.

In the meantime the Sebastocrator John, acting upon the orders of his imperial brother to seek out the Epirote army, learned that the Despot Michael was encamped near Castoria with his wife and all his household. Marching through the vale of Vodena, John made for Castoria, but word of his advance got there just before him and threw the Epirote army into a panic in the middle of the night. Although many lost their lives in an effort to escape, for they could not see where the road was and where there was a precipice, most of the army managed to get to safety in Old Epirus. The Sebastocrator John then overran the territory abandoned by the Epirotes, seizing the undefended cities, with the result that the despot lost all his gains of the previous year. John took Ochrida with the aid of its archbishop, who had accompanied the Nicene army back to his see after the Emperor Michael had allowed him to return home from the exile into which Theodore Lascaris had sent him. Next John captured Devol (Deabolis) by storm, and thereafter had little difficulty in establishing his authority throughout all western Macedonia, securing the submission of Prespa, Pelagonia,

¹ Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 77, ed. Aug. Heisenberg, I (Leipzig, 1903), 160–61; Nic. Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, III, 5, 2 (Bonn, I, 72–73); and see D. M. Nicol, "The Date of the Battle of Pelagonia," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLIX (1956), 68–69. Michael VIII was proclaimed emperor on 1 January, 1259, and was crowned shortly thereafter (Loenertz, *Orient. Christ. periodica*, XXIX, no. 6, pp. 333, 342–44), on which, however, cf. above, Chapter 4, note 37.

² Geo. Pachymeres, *De Michaele Palaeologo*, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 83).

³ In describing Michael VIII's appeal for men, the Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. P. P. Kalonaros, Athens, 1940, vv. 3567–3607, 3703–3709, and the French *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, pars. 268, 270, 279, agree on the numbers of mercenaries who responded except that the French chronicle says Turks came "sans nombre." The Aragonese Chronicle (*Libro de los fechos*), ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, par. 244, and the Italian version, ed. Ch. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 441, increase most of the numbers of these contingents, the Aragonese specifying 1,000 Germans, 2,000 Hungarians, 1,000 Serbs, and 4,000 Alans and Cumans; and the Italian giving 5,000 Serbs and 10,000 Cumans! It seems unlikely that Stephen Uroš, who had just joined Michael II of Epirus, would abandon his ally so quickly and send forces to fight against him, but some disaffected Serbian chieftain might have accepted employment with his own followers. It is possible that the Bulgarian Tsar Constantine Tich, the brother-in-law of John IV Lascaris, and bound to Nicaea by an alliance from 1257, would have sent aid to Michael VIII, who had not yet dethroned and blinded his young co-emperor.

Soscus, and Molyscus. After Devol, which had fallen quickly, John encountered little or no opposition, for the western Greeks, observes Acropolites, were a soft lot, with no stomach for a siege or a fight, and in their anxiety to save their lives were easily subdued by a determined opponent. Acropolites dates all these events in the spring of 1259.⁴

In a passage which appears to refer to the same events the historian Pachymeres adds to his predecessor's list of the places captured a number of others, including the fortress of Berat and the town of Canina near the coast south-east of Avlona.⁵ Pachymeres says that John Palaeologus's drive reached Durazzo. Michael had retreated to the plains of Avlona where he marshaled his forces and whence he sent his daughter Helena to Trani on the south Italian coast where she married Manfred,⁶ whose aid he now solicited with especial fervor. According to Nicephorus Gregoras, Michael laid siege to Berat at this time, which if true would suggest that the Sebastocrator John must have captured the fortress from its Sicilian garrison.⁷ Michael's efforts against Berat were unsuccessful. Obviously he needed help if he was to make progress against the Nicaenes.

Both Manfred and William of Villehardouin answered the Despot Michael's plea for help but not so much to assist Michael, according to Gregoras, as to add to their own domains, hoping to acquire a great stretch of territory from the Ionian Sea to Constantinople.⁸ Acropolites says that Manfred sent "four hundred [German] horsemen, heavily armed cataphracts, riding on stately, spirited steeds;"⁹ this contin-

gent probably comprised a fair portion of the German forces which Manfred had with him in southern Italy. Although Gregoras declares that Manfred came to Greece himself,¹⁰ it is quite apparent that his statement is erroneous.¹¹ But if Manfred did not appear in person, William of Villehardouin did, as the French chronicler of the Morea describes so picturesquely: "When that winter had passed and the new spring came, when the nightingales sing sweetly until the dawn of day and all creatures are renewed and enjoy themselves on earth, Prince William, who was farther away than the despot, collected all his people from the Morea as far as Monemvasia, both those on foot and those on horseback, as mightily as he could."¹²

William crossed over from the Morea to the mainland, entering the despotate by the straits of Naupactus, and made his way to Arta, where Michael II had amassed so large an army that it was a wonder to behold, *que c'estoit merveilles a veoir*. The Frankish chivalry of the Morea was famous, and we may assume that William's knights surpassed in their proud appearance even Manfred's German cavalry concerning which such a glowing report had reached Acropolites. Effecting the juncture of their forces, the Despot Michael and William marched north from Arta through Ianina, across the Pindus mountains, and into southern Thessaly, going a long way around apparently to avoid premature contact with the Sebastocrator John Palaeologus. In the meantime the Latin forces from the great lordship of Athens and Thebes, the barony of Salona, the triarchies of Negroponte, and various islands of the Archipelago

⁴ Acropolites, 80, ed. Heisenberg, I, 165-67.

⁵ Pachymeres, II, 11 (Bonn, I, 107). This passage is certainly out of its proper place in the narrative. It seems to refer to events before the Nicaene occupation of Constantinople (*cf.*, *ibid.*, chap. 12), and so the description of the conquest of these cities should probably refer to the spring of 1259. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, p. 113, understands this passage to relate to John Palaeologus's later Macedonian expedition in 1264 (*cf.* Pachym., III, 20, Bonn, I, 214-15), which seems to be a less satisfactory interpretation. See Nicol, in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLIX (1956), 68-70.

⁶ Acropolites, 81, *ibid.*, I, 168, and for the marriage of Manfred and Helena, see above.

⁷ Nic. Gregoras, III, 5, 2-3 (Bonn, I, 73), on which *cf.* Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957, p. 177, and in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLIX, 70-71.

⁸ Nic. Gregoras, III, 5, 1 (Bonn, I, 72).

⁹ Acropolites, 81, *ibid.*, I, 168, 11. 7-8. and *cf.* Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 107: "400 huomini d'armi Tedeschi."

Pachymeres, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 83, 11. 3-5), identifies the cavalry force as German, but quite incorrectly gives the number of men as three thousand.

¹⁰ Nic. Gregoras, III, 5, 1 and 5 (Bonn, I, 71-72, 75).

¹¹ See M. Dendias, "Le Roi Manfred de Sicile et la bataille de Pelagone," in *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, I (Paris, 1930), 55-60, who shows that Manfred did not go to Greece, and when the Italian chronicler Matteo Spinelli da Giovinazzo, *Diurnali*, in Muratori, *RISS*, VII (Milan, 1725), cols. 1097-98, says under the date September, 1260 (for 1259), that King Manfred "andao in Romagna, et tutta la volta sottosopra," he is in fact referring to the Italian Romagna, then largely held by the Guelfs, against whom Manfred made an expedition. Spinelli's text may also be found in G. Del Re, ed., *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni napoletani*, II (Naples, 1868), 641, and G. Vigo and G. Dura, eds., *Annali di Matteo Spinello da Giovinazzo*, Naples, 1872. Dendias, *op. cit.*, clearly gives the proper interpretation of Spinelli's text.

¹² *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, par. 273, p. 98, and *cf.* the Greek *Chronicle*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3618-25, pp. 155-56.

had moved northwest directly into southern Thessaly, passing through Gravia and Sideroporta, and soon reaching Neopatras (Hypate), where the despot's son John Ducas ruled from the castle he had built on a rocky precipice overlooking the town. These forces were combined with the armies of Michael II and William in the plains of Thalassinum, according to the Greek *Chronicle* (v. 3636), by which seems to be meant the Trachinian plain along the Malian Gulf south of Zeitounion (Lamia) and west of Neopatras.¹³

At this point the leaders took counsel and decided not to waste time trying to take strongly fortified places, but rather to risk a battle in the open field. The French knights were usually impatient of sieges. Accordingly the Graeco-Latin host traveled north, traversing Thessaly, probably going to Larissa and thence along the road to Elassona, and next through the mountains to the castle of Servia in Macedonia, crossing the then northern boundary of Thessaly at a place called Katakolou (in the valley of the river Sarandaporos), said to have been thus named from an estate of the great Byzantine family of the Katakoloi. At Servia they took some prisoners from whom they got information about the movements of the Sebastocrator John, who was at the time probably between Ochrida and Pelagonia, where Michael II and William decided to go, trusting that "God would give them the victory and they would be masters of Romania."¹⁴ We have few logistical details relating to the progress of either army, but in the thirteenth century (as today) an army traveled no faster than its carrier service could move food

and equipment. Wheeled vehicles were necessary for heavy transport, and armies followed the old highways (as today they follow the railroads). In the Middle Ages mud was one of the most hostile forces an army had to contend with, and the rainy seasons were avoided whenever possible; the night attack was very rare, and there was of course no aerial bombardment to interdict the enemy's approach to the battlefield. Although medieval commanders naturally employed ambush and the sudden interceptory attack when they could, they usually expected to meet their opponents in the open field, as was to be the case in the coming engagement.

When the Sebastocrator John mustered his forces in the summer of 1259 upon the approach of the Epirote-Frankish army, he had twenty-seven battalions (ἀλλάγια, *batailles*),¹⁵ including the foreign mercenaries who had been sent to him from Adrianople. There is no way of estimating very closely the size of either of the opposing armies; both suffered from their polyglot composition, but a largely unified authority over his troops gave a decided advantage to the Nicene general.¹⁶ The Epirote-Frankish army had too many leaders. Michael II and his son Nicephorus led the army recruited in Epirus together with, presumably, other Greek and Latin mercenaries. His bastard son John Ducas, who had married the daughter of Taronas, a Thessalian Vlach chieftain, had a large force of Vlachs with which he had already stopped the Sebastocrator John at Berrhoea during the previous winter.¹⁷ Manfred's four hundred German horsemen had their own commander. William of Villehardouin had gathered contingents from most of the Latin states in Greece and the Aegean, a proud panoply of arrogant warriors. According to the exaggerated report of the Aragonese *Chronicle of the Morea*, "the prince had in his company twenty dukes, counts, and barons; some prelates and many knights

¹³ Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3627–36; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, par. 274; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 248–55, where the count of Cephalonia is included among those whom William of Villehardouin ordered to join the feudal levy (par. 253); and cf. the Italian chronicle (*Cronaca di Morea*), ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 441, which is an abridgment from the Greek version. The margrave of Boudonitza, whom William ordered about January, 1259, to turn out the following spring for the levy (*Chron. de Morée*, par. 262), is not mentioned as supplying men-at-arms when the campaign got under way (*ibid.*, par. 274, and cf. the Greek *Chron.*, vv. 3632–33). Kalonaros, *op. cit.*, p. 156, note, places Sideroporta on the present highway from Athens to Lamia, near Eleutherochorion, where remains are still preserved of the medieval castle of Siderocastron, with which Sideroporta is said to be identified.

¹⁴ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 275–78; Greek *Chronicle*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3637–95; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 257 ff.; *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *op. cit.*, pp. 441–42.

¹⁵ Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, vv. 3703–11; *Chronique de Morée*, par. 279. According to the *Libro de los fechos*, par. 259, the army of the Sebastocrator John consisted of 8,000 foreign mercenaries, 12,000 mounted Greeks, and an infantry force of 40,000! On the detachment of troops known as the allagion (ἀλλάγιον), cf. Pachymeres, IV, 27 (Bonn, I, 310), and D. A. Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, II (Athens, 1953), 139.

¹⁶ Cf. Nicol, *Despotate of Epiros*, p. 179.

¹⁷ Pachymeres, I, 30 (Bonn, I, 83), and cf. Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 107, who gives John the name of Theodore (his younger brother) and calls him "lord of Neopatras, Loidoriki, and finally of Vlachia" [Thessaly].

and other people; and all together there were eight thousand first-class men-at-arms and twelve thousand men on foot." The same dubious source reckons the Despot Michael's army as containing eight thousand men-at-arms and eighteen thousand foot soldiers.¹⁸

Preparations for the battle had been extensive on both sides. The domination of the Greek world would apparently be the prize of victory. The Emperor Michael had warned his brother to prefer a cautious opportunism to a direct encounter. The Frankish knights were past masters of the headlong charge; they would stand in their stirrups and rush into battle with stirring war cries. Their impact was difficult to sustain. There was little military strategy in the thirteenth century, but the Sebastocrator John employed such devices as he and his advisers knew. Acropolites says that he put his cavalry and heavy-armed troops in secure places on the neighboring hills while he assigned more mobile units, Cumans, Turks, and a number of Greeks, to immediate action on the plains. Among these were the archers who, after the first contact of the opposing armies at a place called Borilla Longos,¹⁹ near Monastir, kept up an unceasing harassment of the enemy both by day and by night. Constantly in motion, they attacked the Epirotes and Franks when they tried to water their horses; shot at them on the march; and set upon their baggage train. Success fed their courage, and they finally engaged in hand-to-hand combat in order to strip defeated opponents of their valuables. The Epirote army proved unequal to the pummeling and tried to push northwards by way of Stanus, Soscus, and Molyseus toward Prilep, but the going was too hard, and the Despot Michael and his son Nicephorus departed the perilous scene under the cover of night. They knew the roads and made good their escape. When day broke and the Epirote army learned of their leaders' flight, many of them followed suit in frightened haste. The commanders of the remaining Epirote Greek troops offered their services to the Sebastocrator John, as did the bastard John Ducas of Neopatra. The Sebastocrator added their forces to his own and made them swear oaths of allegiance to the emperor of Nicaea.²⁰

¹⁸ *Libro de los fechos*, par. 256.

¹⁹ Longos (λόγγος) denotes a marshy or a woodland waste (cf. Mesolonghi).

²⁰ Acropolites, 81, ed. Heisenberg, I, 168–70.

So much we are told by Acropolites, but the sudden withdrawal of the Despot Michael and his two sons is explained otherwise by Pachymeres. According to the latter, members of William of Villehardouin's retinue, "whom they call knights," deeply offended the bastard John Ducas by leering at his beautiful Vlach wife in contemptuous disregard of her husband. John threatened them, and a violent quarrel ensued. William, being drawn into it, reviled John with the stigma of his birth, leaving the latter in smouldering anger "like another Achilles." Wishing therefore to show that whichever side he fought on would win, John got in touch secretly with the Nicene commanders, offering to join them in an attack upon the Latins provided the safety of his father and brother were guaranteed. Assured thereof by suitable oaths, John persuaded his father and brother to withdraw from the coming contest. John then attacked the Frankish army from the rear. The Latins quickly realized that they had been betrayed and tried to scatter in flight; many of them were slain by the Cumans, and others were captured by the Turks. William of Villehardouin was discovered attempting to hide himself; hauled out from his place of concealment, he was sent off as a prisoner to the imperial court.²¹

²¹ Pachymeres, I, 31 (Bonn, I, 84–86). A passage in Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 107, is sometimes taken as confirmation of Pachymeres' report of the ill treatment accorded John Ducas by the Franks, but Sanudo's account is very brief, vague, and generally inaccurate: ". . . ed avvenne che passando per il stato che tenivano i Greci, li Greci lo tradirono, e trà li altri suo cognato Sevasto Cratora per offesa che avea riceputo da Latini, e il principe con suoi baroni fu fatto prigionero. . . ." That the Greeks and Latins got along badly is very likely; ill feeling, caused by generations of theological and political rancor, had made the triple alliance an unnatural union from the beginning.

But had the unseemly attention of Frankish knights to John Ducas's wife been the cause of his joining the Nicene forces, I think that Acropolites would have mentioned it. Having talked for some days with the Nicene generals Alexius Strategopoulos and John Raoul shortly after the battle of Pelagonia (οἷς καὶ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας ξυνομιλήσας . . . , ed. Heisenberg, I, 171, 11. 17–18), as we shall see below, Acropolites undoubtedly asked them all about the battle. A little while later Acropolites also spent some time with the Sebastocrator John (and presumably with John Ducas himself) at Neopatra (*ibid.*, 11. 23–26) where the battle must have again been discussed at length, but Acropolites does not mention the episode involving John Ducas's wife, and his contemporary account is generally to be preferred to that of Pachymeres, written decades after the event. Finally we should observe that Pachymeres himself takes especial care to indicate that, although he had heard

Of William of Villehardouin's attempted flight from Pelagonia there is no doubt. Acropolites says that, after the defection of the Ducae, William and his knights scattered, every man for himself, but William was soon found at Castoria hiding under a heap of chaff, and a soldier recognized him by his large protruding front teeth. He was put in fetters and shipped off to the Emperor Michael. Anseau of Toucy, Geoffrey of Karytaina, and some thirty other Frankish knights were shackled like their prince and sent to the imperial court. Manfred's four hundred German horsemen, obviously baffled by the ways of warfare in the Levant, surrendered with their arms and horses to four Nicene officers, one of whom was Alexius Strategopoulus, the grand domestic. They too were sent to the emperor. The fame of this victory, which Acropolites credits to the wise counsels of the Emperor Michael, spread to the ends of the earth, for the sun on high had rarely beheld such victories.²² Such exaggeration was pardonable. It was an astonishing success.

the story somewhere, he cannot vouch for it; he twice uses Herodotus's convenient phrase "it is said," λέγεται (Bonn, I, 84, 11. 10, 18) to introduce a story which almost all historians, from Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 283 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 217), to D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 68–72, have probably taken too seriously.

The battle of Pelagonia was fought apparently in the fall of 1259 (cf. R. J. Loenertz, "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," in the *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II [Studi e testi, 232], Città del Vaticano, 1964, no. 4, pp. 403, 413, although D. M. Nicol, "The Date of the Battle of Pelagonia," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLIX [1956], 68–71, is inclined to date it as early as July).

²² Acropolites, 81, *ibid.*, I, 170–71. According to Nic. Gregoras, III, 5, 4–5 (Bonn, I, 74–75), the Sebastocrator John had sent to the camp of the Despot Michael at night a pretended deserter who said: "Know that today great danger hangs over you and all your army, for both your sons-in-law and allies, the prince of the Peloponnesus and Achaea and the king of Sicily, have secretly sent agents to the Romans to offer peace in return for certain concessions [δώρα τακτά]. If you value your life, therefore, take thought for your safety as soon as possible, before their treaty and agreement are concluded!" Michael believed him, continues Gregoras, and fled before sunrise, and when his soldiers found out that he had gone they also sought safety in flight. When the westerners learned of what they believed to be Epirote treachery, they too tried to flee, the prince of Achaea being captured and the king of Sicily escaping with a very few of his followers, while most of their forces were destroyed by a Nicene attack. Gregoras, writing almost a century after the battle of Pelagonia, is not well informed. It is quite certain that Manfred was not present at the battle (cf. Dendias, "Le Roi Manfred de Sicile et la bataille de Pélagonie," in

The Sebastocrator John pressed on through Thessaly without delay, fortifying towns and castles as he went. He established his camp at Neopatras, whither John Ducas had accompanied him. In the meantime Alexius Strategopoulus and John Raoul, the sebastocrator's chief generals, went through the Pindus mountains (τὰ Πυρρηναῖα) and, leaving troops behind for the siege of Ianina, continued on to Arta, the Epirote capital, which they captured, and where they found the historian George Acropolites, who had been the despot's prisoner for almost two years. Acropolites thus had a chance to talk with Strategopoulus and Raoul for a few days (as he informs us) while the details of the campaign were obviously fresh in their minds. Acropolites is consequently our best source for the events leading up to Pelagonia as well as for the battle itself although his account differs markedly in some respects from those of Pachymeres and Gregoras. Acropolites was glad to leave the city of his long confinement, especially since the residents of Arta were ill disposed toward the eastern Greeks, and the historian admits that the Nicene army treated the populace badly (οὐ γὰρ καλῶς οἱ τῶν στρατευμάτων τούτοις ἐχρήσαντο): "and so that glorious victory which had shone upon the Romans came not long afterwards to a contrary issue." But however that was to be, Acropolites now hastened to join the Sebastocrator John at Neopatras and after spending some days with him finally returned to the Nicene court.

The Sebastocrator John maintained his drive against the Latins a little longer. Bypassing Livadia, he took Thebes and stripped the city, which was the capital of the great Burgundian lordship in Boeotia and Attica. Meanwhile John Ducas, uncomfortable in his association with the

Mélanges Charles Diehl, I [1930], 55–60). That thirty Frankish knights were captured by the Nienes after the battle appears from Manuel Holobolus, *Orationes*, ed. M. Treu, 2 vols., Potsdam, 1906–7, I, 42, cited by D. J. Geanakoplos, "Greco-Latin Relations," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII (1953), 128, 130, and *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 68, 70.

Despite the confusion and general inaccuracy of the *Chronicles of the Morea*, they supply a number of interesting and picturesque details concerning the battle of Pelagonia, the heroism of Geoffrey of Karytaina, and the interview which took place after the battle between the Sebastocrator John and William of Villehardouin, *qui sages estoit et parloit auques bien le grec*: *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 280–312, pp. 101–15; *Greek Chronicle*, ed. Kalonaros, vv. 3712–4203, pp. 160–79; *Libro de las fechas*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 262–84, pp. 58–63; *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 442–46.

Nicene army since the battle of Pelagonia, had slipped away with some of his retainers to join his father Michael II, who after the fall of Arta had sought refuge first on the island of Leukas and then at the court of the Orsini in Cephalonia.²³

The battle of Pelagonia had undoubtedly sounded the death knell of the Latin empire of Constantinople, which fell almost by accident to the Nicene general Alexius Strategopoulus two years later (1261), thus helping to effect the final reconstruction of the Byzantine empire. It was also to result in grave damage to the Frankish principality of Achaëa, but strangely enough it did not mean the end of the despotate of Epirus even though the Nicene forces overran, as the Emperor Michael VIII says in his so-called autobiography, "Acarnania and Aetolia, the region around the Gulf of Crissa [the Gulf of Salona], and all Epirus both old and new, Illyria as far as Durazzo, and all Phocis. . . ."²⁴ The Ducae had managed to retain the fortress of Vonitza, on the southern shore of the Gulf of Arta, which was used as the center of operations for a northward march which retook the city of Arta with the aid of the loyal inhabitants and then went on to relieve the siege of Ianina. Already the Nicenes were beginning to lose the fruits of the Emperor Michael's wise counsels to his commanders in the field, to whose disobedience and lack of discipline Acropolites attributes their expulsion from Old Epirus, where a year after the virtual destruction of his state Michael II ruled again as despot and was plotting the expansion of his domains by conquest from Nicaea.²⁵

The young Despot Nicephorus, the son of Michael II, is said by the chronicler Matteo

Spinelli da Giovinazzo to have gone to Italy on 3 December, 1259, about two months or so after the battle of Pelagonia, in an attempt to bring Pope Alexander IV and Manfred together in opposition to Michael VIII.²⁶ The evidence of Spinelli is usually suspect, but the Italian embassy of Nicephorus seems to be confirmed by Pachymeres, who states that Michael II, in sadly straitened circumstances after Pelagonia, asked Manfred for more aid and received it (καὶ πλείστην συμμαχίαν λαβών): Michael placed Manfred's forces under the command of Nicephorus, who defeated the Caesar Alexius Strategopoulus with them in 1260 in a bloody battle near Salona at Tricoryphus ("Three Peaks"). Among the captives taken by Nicephorus was Strategopoulus himself, but the young despot released him after a treaty had been arranged between them, and Strategopoulus apparently returned to Nicaea. The situation caused sufficient uneasiness at the Nicene court for the Emperor Michael to send his brother John back to Macedonia. John had been promoted to the rank of despot because of his recent victories over the Epirote despots, but now Manfred's forces are vaguely said to have occupied "many places in the Illyrias and New Epirus," and John's task was to oppose their advance into Macedonia.²⁷

The Emperor Michael VIII had spent the winter at Lampsacus, after which he went in the summer of 1260 to the region of Constantinople, expecting to acquire the city through the treachery of a Latin resident, one Anseau or Ansel ('Ασέλ), perhaps de Toucy, who had been captured at Pelagonia. This Anseau, who seems to have been related to the emperor by marriage, had a house in Constantinople, and claimed to be in charge of the gates in his neighborhood. Anseau had said that the gates could be opened surreptitiously to admit the Nicene troops, and

²³ Acropolites, 82, ed. Heisenberg, I, 171–72.

²⁴ Michael VIII has described the triumph of his forces from Pelagonia to the Peloponnesus in his memoir *De vita sua* (actually a monastic rule or *typikon* intended by Michael for the monastery of S. Demetrius in Constantinople), ed. I. G. Troitskii, S. Petersburg, 1885, and ed. Henri Grégoire, *Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi de vita sua opusculum necnon regulae quam ipse monasterio S. Demetrii praescripsit fragmentum*, chap. VII, in *Byzantion*, XXIX–XXX (1959–60), 455. The alleged chronicler of S. Justina in Padua understood perfectly that Pelagonia meant the end of the Latin occupation of Constantinople (*Annales S. Iustinae patavini*, in *MGH, Scriptores*, XIX [1866], 181–82). The *Annales patavini* were later published as the *Chronicon Marchiae Tarvisinae*, in *RISS*, VIII-3 (1916), on which see below, note 39.

²⁵ Acropolites, 82, *ibid.*, I, 172. As a reward for their services John Palaeologus was made a despot, and Alexius Strategopoulus received the title of caesar.

²⁶ Spinelli, *Diurnali*, ad ann. 1259, in Muratori, *RISS*, VII (Milan, 1725), cols. 1095–96; also *Annali di Matteo Spinello da Giovinazzo*, eds. Vigo and Dura (1872), p. 43, where *lo piscopo* stands for *disposto*. Spinelli says that Nicephorus landed at Vieste on the peninsula of Mt. Gargano. Cf. Giuseppe del Giudice, "La Famiglia di Re Manfredi," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, III (1878), 23–26, 58–63; Geanakoplos, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII, p. 133, note 165.

²⁷ Pachymeres, I, 32, and II, 26 (Bonn, I, 89, 137), and cf. Hopf, in *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 285 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 219). Strategopoulus was again captured, later on, by the Despot Michael, who sent him to Manfred; the latter exchanged him in 1262 for his sister Constance, whom Pachymeres calls by her Greek name Anna (*loc. cit.*, Bonn, I, 89, 11. 18–22). Cf., above, Chapter 3, note 73.

thus Michael might acquire the city without the hardships of a siege; Anseau was released for this purpose, given gifts and honors, and returned to Constantinople where Michael kept in touch with him by secret messengers. In the meantime the Nicene army had encamped at Galata where Michael made an unsuccessful attempt to take the citadel while he waited for Anseau to do what he had promised; but the latter had no intention of betraying the city, and finally informed the disappointed Michael that the Latin Emperor Baldwin had taken the gate keys away from him. Michael withdrew toward the Hellespont. Three Latin envoys went after him to request a peace, which Acropolites says Michael granted for one year.²⁸

Returning to Asia Minor, Michael halted at Pegae for a while and then went on to Nymphaeum where he planned to spend the winter which was already at hand, and where he soon negotiated the famous alliance with the Genoese (on 13 March, 1261).²⁹ In return for the naval assistance which he required for the recapture of Constantinople, Michael agreed to grant the Genoese extraordinary political rights and economic privileges in the major ports of the empire, especially in Smyrna. The treaty was an expression of Byzantine hostility toward the Venetians, whom the Genoese were to replace

as the favored Latin colony on the Bosphorus when Michael should retake Constantinople.³⁰ Even if the terms of the treaty of Nymphaeum were never put fully into effect (for the Greeks were very shortly to regain their lost capital without Genoese aid), it was an important measure, for it helped bring on the day when the Genoese colony at Galata would become an almost independent state on the northern shore of the Golden Horn.

For some time the Venetians had felt a sense of disquiet, and in the late spring of 1260 the Doge Ranieri Zeno had granted Tommaso Giustinian, bailie of Negroponte, and the latter's councillors full power to negotiate with Guy I de la Roche of Athens and the Moreote barons (Prince William of Villehardouin being then of course a Nicene captive), the Euboeote triarchs Guglielmo I da Verona and Narzotto dalle Carceri, the Venetian feudatories on Crete, Duke Angelo Sanudo of Naxos and his son-in-law the "Grand Duke" Paolo Navigajoso of Lemnos, the young Count Riccardo Orsini of Cephalonia, and the Venetian lordlings of the Aegean, as well as any others whose help might seem necessary to assure the Emperor Baldwin's possession of Constantinople against the Greeks. The bailie was to propose that the Republic, the Moreote barons, and the various dynasts of the Archipelago should put one thousand men into Constantinople and keep them there "for all time," the expenses being shared according to a formula which the bailie was authorized to work out with the other participants in the league.³¹

In the meantime, Michael VIII had sent his faithful servitor George Acropolites on a diplomatic mission to the court of the Bulgarian Tsar Constantine Tich. The Bulgars made much of the Christmas season (of 1260), and Constantine insisted that Acropolites watch all the festivities. The historian had no other choice and spent several days at Tirnovo, after which he returned to Nymphaeum with messages from the tsar to Michael.³² Although Acropolites says little

²⁸ Acropolites, 83, *ibid.*, I, 173–75. Pachymeres, II, 20 (Bonn, I, 122–24), and Nic. Gregoras, IV, 1, 4 (Bonn, I, 80–81), both describe the failure of the assault upon Galata, but know nothing of the expected treason of Anseau (*cf.* Geanakoplos, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VII, 137–41, and *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 76–79) nor of the one-year truce (Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 [1932], no. 1885, p. 36).

²⁹ Camillo Manfroni, "Le Relazioni fra Genova, l'impero bizantino e i Turchi," in *Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria*, XXVIII (1896–1902), 656–66, with the Latin text of the treaty of Nymphaeum on pp. 791–809; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1890; L. T. Belgrano and Cesare Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, 5 vols., 1890–1929 (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, nos. 11–14), IV (1926), 42–43; Martino da Canale, *La Cronique des Veniciens*, chap. CLXXIV, ed. F. L. Polidori in *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (Florence, 1845), 480; Hopf, in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 260 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 194); Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 83–91. The treaty of Nymphaeum was ratified by the Genoese government on 10 July, 1261 (*cf.* Manfroni, *op. cit.*, pp. 658, 666, 791, 807). The Byzantine envoys sent to Genoa by Michael VIII had apparently required and accepted certain changes in the initial texts (*Annali genovesi*, IV, 42): ". . . et factis quibusdam mutationibus et promissionibus ab ipsis nunciis imperatoris, confederatio predicta in civitate Ianue fuit firma[ta] et iurata."

³⁰ *Cf.* H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 329–30, 344 ff. The purpose of the convention was in fact a Genoese-Byzantine war against the Venetians.

³¹ Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, append. no. XIII, pp. 759–60, doc. undated, but probably May or early June, 1260; Hopf, in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 280b, 308a, 314–15 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 214b, 242a, 248–49); Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1959, pp. 144–45.

³² Acropolites, 84, ed. Heisenberg, I, 175–76, and *cf.* Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1888, p. 36.

about his mission to Bulgaria, it may have been only partially successful, because the following summer (1261) the emperor sent the Caesar Alexius Strategopoulus with a "Scythian" (Cuman) force and some auxiliaries into Thrace to guard the roads from the mountains, for both the Bulgars and of course the Epirotes were causing the Nicene government some uneasiness. Constantine Tich had married Theodore Lascaris's daughter Irene, who was urging him to attack imperial territory to avenge the (by now) manifest dethronement of her brother John IV.³³ Strategopoulus's troops were to keep a sharp lookout for trouble. On his way to Thrace he was also to approach the walls of Constantinople as a threatening gesture, and to watch the Latin reaction to the presence of his army. There was no thought of his taking the city. He had too small a force and lacked siege engines.

Crossing the Hellespont, Strategopoulus arrived at Gallipoli, where he decided to go along the northern shore of the Sea of Marmara to Selymbria and move on Constantinople directly from the west. It was all Nicene territory, almost to the walls of the city. Pitching his tents in the very suburbs of the Latin "empire" on the Bosphorus, he summoned various Nicene sympathizers to his headquarters. The imperial court had long been full of talk about capturing Constantinople, Michael VIII himself having made one or two half-hearted attempts to take the city. Strategopoulus now spoke of the old hope and held out the expectation of rewards to those who should assist in its fulfilment. In answer he was told there could be no better opportunity than that offered by present circumstances, for the entire Venetian squadron had gone with most of the Latin garrison under the Venetian podestà, Marco Gradenigo (1258–1261), an unduly ambitious man, to take over the Greek island of Daphnusia in the Black Sea.³⁴ The Latin Emperor Baldwin held the city with a very small force. Impressed with the sincerity of his informants and their willingness to help, Strategopoulus made the decision which was to render notable an otherwise mediocre military

career. He announced that he would try to take the city. Apparently irresolute by nature, he was soon almost sick with indecision as he thought of the failures of John Asen II and Vatatzes and other great generals before and after their time. The capture of Constantinople had been the dream of all Nicene (and Epirote) statesmen since the earliest memories that Strategopoulus retained from his boyhood. Now he proposed to make that dream a reality with a paltry force and no previous planning. When he called a meeting of his officers, however, his cousin Alexius vigorously advocated making the attempt, as did a certain Cutritzaces (Κουτρίτζακης), one of the Nicene sympathizers, who lived in or near Constantinople.³⁵

Strategopoulus was convinced that he had a good chance of success, and Pachymeres implies that he was merely casting his lot with fate itself. Once committed, Strategopoulus worked hard and surveyed the walls in detail with Cutritzaces, who knew the whole area very well. Cutritzaces was a leader of one of the groups of local Greeks, comprising agricultural workers, general laborers, chapmen, other such folk, to whom Pachymeres gives the name "Volunteers" (Θεληματάριοι).³⁶ Being allegedly neutral in the continuing contest between the Greeks and Latins, the "Thelematarii" lived both within and without the walls and offered their services to either side as they perceived the opportunity or accepted the necessity to do so. But there could be little question that most of them preferred to "volunteer" their services to their fellow Greeks rather than to the Latins. They not only served others at will (θέλημα), so to speak, but also served at the will of others.

All thought of idle parades under the walls to frighten the Latins was abandoned, and everything was done to allay the suspicions of those in the city. Success would depend on speedy action. The attempt would be made quietly at night. Like hunters tracking down some deadly game, Pachymeres says, Strategopoulus's men put scaling ladders on the walls at a

³³ Pachymeres, II, 26 (Bonn, I, 138).

³⁴ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 114–15, and cf. the so-called *Fragmentum* of Sanudo, *ibid.*, p. 172. Marco Gradenigo had previously been bailie of Negroponte when the Euboeote triarchs promised the Venetian government to wage their "viva guerra" against Prince William of Achaea (G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, III [Vienna, 1857, repr. Amsterdam, 1964], 1–16).

³⁵ Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 105–6, strangely misreads Pachymeres, II, 26 (Bonn, I, 139, 11. 14–15), to create a non-existent Alexius Cutritzaces, whom he makes Strategopoulus's nephew. Pachymeres carefully distinguishes between Alexius and Cutritzaces, who was one of the "Thelematarii" (on whom see below, and also note Pachymeres, vol. I, p. 148, 11. 14–17).

³⁶ Pachymeres, II, 14 (Bonn, I, 110, 11. 16–17): "ἦσαν γοῦν μεταξύ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἰταλῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκέκληντο καὶ Θεληματάριοι. . . ."

carefully chosen spot. Acropolites has a different account of how Nicene soldiers got into the city. He says that Strategopoulus's informants told him of an opening in the wall (ὁπήν τινα εἶναι περὶ τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως) through which one armed man at a time could pass. One man after another went through this aperture until fifteen or more men had got into the city. Mounting the wall from the inside, some of these men seized the only guard they found and threw him down outside; others hacked with axes at the cross-bars which held the gates, and opened at least one to the Nicene army which waited in readiness to enter.³⁷

Pachymeres gives a long and exciting description of the Greek recovery of Constantinople, telling how Strategopoulus had massed all his forces at the appointed time and place, and then waited as the night passed, fearing treachery. Cutritzaces did his best to reassure him, but as the delay continued Strategopoulus suspected him also, and envisaged the destruction of his army in a Latin trap. Hours seemed to pass before there was any sign from their collaborators within the city. The army waited in silence. The sign was to be an acclamation (εὐφημία) such as that accorded the emperors, delivered from the wall in a loud, clear voice. One by one chosen men had climbed scaling ladders to the

top of the walls where they found the Latin guards asleep "and brought them a fearful dream." Some of the guards, seized before they could wake up, were strangled and thrown to the ground outside the walls. Others who had been awakened were promptly killed with swords before they could sound an alarm. The intrepid band then made for the Gate of the Fountain which they found barricaded with a mound of stones they had to remove to make a passage; then prying off the hinges with bronze wedges, they tore down the gate. The imperial acclamation was loudly shouted from atop the wall, easily heard by the anxious Strategopoulus and his waiting army. They rushed from their places of concealment (around the nearby monastery of the Fountain), and were soon crowding through the opened gate. It was the first hour of dawn.

In the bewilderment of success some of the Nicene troops apparently began to attack or seize whomever or whatever they encountered first, but the Cumans maintained their military discipline, and cleared the streets of the crowd of citizens which assembled to find out what was happening. Strategopoulus proceeded systematically and with caution, an old hand at the forcible entry of citadels and cities. He wanted to be certain of the strength of the Latin defenders before his troops had penetrated too deeply into the city. He was appalled at the first sight of the Latin force, more numerous apparently than he had expected. Pachymeres says he almost gave orders for retreat, but the local Greek "Volunteers" who had helped him fought furiously, certain of their own destruction if this venture should fail. The Latins were soon repulsed, however, and sought safety by scattering in the still dark hours of the morning. The Latin Emperor Baldwin, apprised of the Nicene advance into the city, thought only of flight; leaving the palace of Blachernae in the northwest corner of the city, he fled to the Great Palace by the sea. He lost his hat, threw away his sword, and left behind the insignia of empire in his haste to get away.³⁸

By this time the Venetian fleet of allegedly some thirty ships, including galleys, had come back from the unsuccessful attack upon Daphnusia. News of the Nicene attempt to take the city and fears for their wives, children, and property had led all on board to make the speediest possible return. The invaders had set fire to

³⁷ Acropolites, 85, *ibid.*, I, 181–82; Pachymeres, II, 26–27 (Bonn, I, 137–40). Nic. Gregoras, IV, 2, 3 (Bonn, I, 85, 11. 13–15), whose account seems to be dependent upon that of Acropolites, says that access to the city was gained through an underground passage. According to Acropolites (*loc. cit.*, p. 182, 11. 19–20), Strategopoulus's army consisted of Greeks (*Romaiot*) and "Scythians" (Cumans), and according to Pachymeres (p. 137, 11. 20–21), of Scythians "with not many others." Gregoras (p. 83, 11. 9–10 ff.) says that Strategopoulus was given a force of 800 Bithynians with orders to recruit as many more as he needed from Thrace and Macedonia, and that his troops were intended primarily for service against Michael II of Epirus. The Byzantine rhetorician Manuel Holobolus, *Orationes*, ed. M. Treu, I (1906), 67, observes that Strategopoulus had only a "slender force" (*στράτευμα βραχύ*), which is undoubtedly true, but in an undated letter of 1262 (perhaps in May or June) Pope Urban IV wrote the provincial minister of the Franciscans in France that "Paleologus namque scismaticus, qui Gregorum imperatorem vocari se facit . . . , congregato . . . exercitu copioso, et civitatis Constantinopolitane finibus appropinquans, civitatem eandem, cum non posset illam violenter capere, proditorialiter occupavit, collocans in ea superbie sue sedem in sempiternum obprobrium Latinorum" (Jean Guiraud, ed., *Les Registres d'Urban IV* [1261–1264], II [Paris, 1901], no. 131, pp. 46–47). Urban is here apparently linking Strategopoulus's seizure of Constantinople (*proditorialiter*) with Michael's subsequent entry into the city when Greek forces were concentrated to hold the newly won prize (*congregato . . . exercitu copioso*).

³⁸ Pachymeres, II, 27 (Bonn, I, 143–44).

the Latin quarters in the city, especially that of the Venetians, and the commanders of the fleet decided a landing would be suicidal; they took on board to the fullest capacity of their ships all the Latins who could reach them. A galley was sent in to the shore near the Great Palace, and Baldwin seems to have been fortunate to get aboard in the perilous operation. "Thus it came about that by divine providence the city of Constantine passed again into the hands of the emperor of the Romans in just and fitting fashion, on 25 July, the fourth indiction, in the year of the world's creation 6769, after the enemy had held it for fifty-eight years."³⁹

When rumor first reached him that Strategopoulus had taken Constantinople, the Emperor Michael was encamped at Meteorium. After an anxious day a messenger confirmed the news, and Michael began a march to the city, stopping near Achyraus where Baldwin's imperial insignia, the products of Latin craftsmanship, were delivered to him. Now even the most skeptical could no longer doubt that Constantinople had

in fact been rewon. Approaching the city, Michael began to think of the proper way for him to make his entrance; not with pomp and military display, he decided, but in a way more pleasing to God.⁴⁰ He wanted Nicephorus Blemmydes to compose prayers of thanksgiving for the occasion. Blemmydes lived too far away in Ephesus, however, and so Acropolites offered to write suitable prayers, to which Michael agreed, being naturally impatient to establish himself in Constantinople.

The imperial entourage reached the city on 14 August, but Michael did not want to enter the city the same day. He pitched his tents at the monastery of Cosmidium near Blachernae; here he spent the night, going into the city the next day. George Cleidas, the metropolitan of Cyzicus, celebrated the victory in the absence of the patriarch. Climbing into one of the towers of the Golden Gate, and carrying with him the icon of the Virgin which belonged to the monastery of the Hodegetria, George recited the prayers before a throng that must have been profoundly moved. The emperor, with head uncovered, fell to the ground on bended knees, as did all those present. When the first prayer was concluded, the dean indicated that they should stand, after which they raised their voices a hundred times in the *Kyrie eleēson*, and then the ceremonies continued. They went on for days.⁴¹ But Michael, full of gratitude as he was for this signal mark of divine favor, thought constantly of the political significance of Strategopoulus's remarkable achievement, and he soon set about the rebuilding of his new capital, which the grim years of Latin occupation had left almost desolate.

The Latin Emperor Baldwin, after escaping

³⁹ Acropolites, 85, *ibid.*, I, 182–83 (in the quotation "Romans" [*Romaioi*] means Greeks, as almost always in Byzantine texts of this period); Pachymeres, II, 27 (Bonn, I, 141–49), who observes (p. 148, ll. 3–4) that the Latins suffered as much in their loss of Constantinople in 1261 as the Greeks had in 1204; Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938–48), 311, 369; Martino da Canale, *Cronique des Veniciens*, chap. CLXXV, in *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (1845), 480; *Chronicon Marchiae Tarvisinae et Lombardiae*, ed. L. A. Botteghi, in *RISS*, VIII-3 (Città di Castello, 1916), 47–48, which is the only significant reference to Greece in the *Chron. March. Tarvisinae*, a contemporary north Italian chronicle covering the period from 1207 to 1270, sometimes badly informed (previously published as the *Annales Sanctae Justinae patavini*, ed. Philip Jaffé, in *MGH*, SS., XIX [Hanover, 1866], 181–82). Manuel Holobolus, *Orationes*, ed. Treu, I, 67–68, cited by Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 95–115; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1261, nos. 26 ff., ed. A. Theiner, XXII (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), pp. 174 ff.; Hopf, vol. 85, p. 261 (repr. I, 195). It is doing the thirteenth-century Jacobite historian Bar Hebraeus, learned "maphrian" of the East from 1264, no injustice to say that he knows little either of the taking of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusaders in 1204 or of the Greek recovery of the city in 1261 (*The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj . . . Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus*, trans. from the Syriac by E. A. Wallis Budge, I [Oxford and London, 1932], 357 ff., 428–29). In addition to the thirty Venetian ships the escaping Latins sought safety aboard a large Sicilian transport (Pachymeres, *loc. cit.*, Bonn, I, 145, l. 15, and p. 147, l. 1). According to the *Chronicles of the Morea*, about three thousand Latins fled Constantinople (see the Greek version, ed. Kalonaros, v. 1305, and *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, par. 85, p. 27: ". . . l'empereur Bauduin . . . si entra en une nef ou bien iii M. personnes").

⁴⁰ Michael VIII claimed of course that the recovery of Constantinople was a signal mark of God's favor to him (*De vita sua*, chap. VIII, ed. H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, XXIX–XXX [1959–60], 457).

⁴¹ Acropolites, 86–88, *ibid.*, I, 183–89 (here Acropolites' *Chronicle* comes to an end); Pachymeres, II, 29 ff. (Bonn, I, 149 ff., detailed and interesting); and Nic. Gregoras, IV, 2, 3–7 (Bonn, I, 85–89), who says that upon entering Constantinople the Nicenes set fires in four places (p. 85, ll. 20–22). Strategopoulus was accorded a triumph for his capture of the city. The famous icon of the Hodegetria, believed to have been painted by S. Luke, had apparently been kept from 1206 to 1261 in the Venetian church of the Pantokrator, whence it was recovered at Michael Palaeologus's command in order that it might be carried at the head of his triumphal procession and thereafter restored to the monastery of the Hodegetria (see R. L. Wolff " . . . The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria," *Traditio*, VI [1948], 320–21, 325–27).

from Constantinople, landed briefly at Negroponte, where the triarchs gave him a splendid reception befitting the imperial glory he was never again to know. When all allowance is made for his good qualities, Baldwin had had a sorry reign (1237–1261); now he had little left but the imperial title and some Byzantine reliquaries with their precious contents. The relics proved to be negotiable for cash, and this Baldwin and his retinue needed beyond everything else, so desperate was their plight. The relics were in fact a godsend, because less celestial sources of revenue had long been in Venetian hands. From Negroponte, Baldwin went on to Thebes and Athens; he was entertained in the castles on the Cadmea and the Acropolis. There were doubtless some present at these banquets given by Guy I de la Roche, now back from his sojourn in France, who recalled the reception given Baldwin's predecessor Henry in 1209 when the Latin empire was just entering its short-lived period of grandeur. A monarch who has lost his throne is certain of the sympathy of the ladies, and the duchess of Naxos, mother of Marco II Sanudo, came to add her gifts to those which Baldwin was receiving from the triarchs and the lord of Athens. He had an additional source of income in the multiplicity of knightships which he created. Continuing on into the Morea, Baldwin sailed from Glarentza to Apulia, where King Manfred received him cordially. The following year Baldwin went to France, seeking men and money for a cause beyond all help,⁴² and beginning thus to play the role of a monarch in exile.

While he was in Athens in October, 1261, Baldwin had repaid a loan of 5,000 hyperperi of gold which Othon de Cicon, lord of Carystus, had made him some time before, *por le grant nécessité de nos et de nostre empire*, by a gift to Othon of the right hand and part of the arm of John the Baptist, a prized Byzantine relic, wherewith the Savior had been baptized, which the worthy lord

of Carystus soon gave to the abbey of Cîteaux in Burgundy, seeking the prayers of the Cistercians for his not inconsiderable generosity (20–21 March, 1263).⁴³ And the monks doubtless did pray for him, that "the Lord reward him according to his works."

Constantinople had fallen during a papal interregnum. Alexander IV had died at Viterbo on 27 May, 1261; Urban IV was elected on 29 August. As soon as Michael Palaeologus heard of Urban's election, he sent to the Curia Romana an embassy consisting of two former secretaries of the Latin imperial chancery, who received a harsh reception in Italy. Michael wished the new pope to send legates to the Byzantine court to discuss the possible union of the Churches. Since Michael's embassy apparently left for the Curia in October or November, 1261, it is clear that he was wasting no time in trying to employ diplomacy to protect himself against a quick reprisal.⁴⁴

Michael VIII was wise not to waste time. While in Italy, the Latin Emperor Baldwin put in a sad appearance before Urban IV, who wrote King Louis IX of France from Viterbo on 5 June, 1262, that the terrible news of the fall of Constantinople had burst upon his ears like some sort of explosion (*veluti ex quodam terrifico sonitu vehementer attoniti*). His Holiness was stunned by this fearful loss to Christendom, and poured forth prayers to the Almighty, who was obviously punishing the Latins for their unending sins. But the Venetians had promised a fleet, and the Latin magnates in Greece were gathering an army to help rewin the great city on the Bosphorus. Urban looked to France, however, "the mirror and exemplar of all the Christian kingdoms," to begin action against the Greek usurper, for then the other states in Europe would follow suit and the expedition would soon get under way.⁴⁵

⁴² Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 115, and Sanudo's so-called *Fragmentum*, *ibid.*, p. 172; Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 311; Martino da Canale, *Cronique des Veniciens*, chaps. CLXXV, CLXXXIX, in *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (1845), pp. 480, 498; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), 261 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 195); Chas. J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, trans. H. Leclercq, VI-1 (Paris, 1914), 153 ff.; Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, vv. 1296–1315, pp. 88, 89; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 84–85, p. 27; *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 422.

⁴³ *Acta Sanctorum*, Iunii tom. IV (Antwerp, 1707), pp. 768–69 (*De reliquiis S. Ioannis Baptistae*); Paul Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I (Geneva, 1877), pp. clxxxii–iii, and *Epp. et instrumenta* in vol. II (1878), nos. XCIII, XCV–XCVII, pp. 144–49; cf. Hopf, *Storia di Karystos*, trans. G. B. Sardagna, Venice, 1856, p. 30; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 115; and Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, p. 228, where the loan made by Othon de Cicon to the Emperor Baldwin is erroneously given as 15,000 hyperperi.

⁴⁴ Pachymeres, II, 36 (Bonn, I, 168–69), on which see R. J. Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 171–73.

⁴⁵ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1262, nos. 39–43, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 89–90, "datum Viterbii non. Iunii, anno

The Minorites in France were directed to preach the Crusade against the "schismatic Palaeologus, who has himself called emperor of the Greeks."⁴⁶ Funds being collected in France for the *subsidiū Terrae Sanctae* were to be spent for three years on the task of restoring the dispossessed Baldwin to the lost throne of the Courtenay in Constantinople.⁴⁷ Urban IV also excommunicated the Genoese because of the alliance they had made with Michael Palaeologus

primo." Cf. Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II (1901), no. 132, p. 48. According to Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RiSS*, XII-1, 311, Urban IV heard the explosive news of the Greek reoccupation of Constantinople from the Venetian embassy of obedience which went to the Curia Romana to congratulate Urban upon his elevation to the throne, "et postea flebilem amissionem Constantinopolitane urbis illi [the Venetian envoys] indicant, qui [papa] merore stupefactus de celeri remedio providere per literas duci promittit." Urban IV reminded Louis IX that, if the Greeks also occupied the *residuum eiusdem imperii* (i.e. Greece and the islands), passage to the Holy Land would be blocked (Raynaldus, *loc. cit.*, no. 43, vol. XXII, p. 90b). But Louis IX had no heart for fighting Christians, even schismatics, reserving his hostility for the Moslems. On Urban IV's crusading efforts, see Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz* (1903), pp. 401ff.; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 139 ff.; and Burkhard Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon (1274)*, Bonn, 1964, pp. 20 ff. (Bonner Historische Forschungen, vol. 24). Urban IV, born Jacques Pantaléon, was the son of a shoemaker in Troyes; he was patriarch of Jerusalem at the time of his election (29 August, 1261); pro-French and anti-Genoese, he was better acquainted with Palestinian than with Greek affairs.

⁴⁶ Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, no. 131, pp. 46-48. The bull is undated, but was presumably written in June, 1262, as Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1262, no. 38, vol. XXII (1870), p. 89b, believes; Guiraud does not note that Raynaldus, *loc. cit.*, nos. 34-38, vol. XXII, pp. 88-89, gives the full text of this letter. It seems unnecessary and is certainly impracticable to note every papal letter relating to the Crusade and the mendicant missions to the East. Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 413-23, gives brief summaries of more than 180 such letters from 1228 to 1301, and his list is incomplete.

⁴⁷ Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, nos. 133-37, pp. 48-49, docs. dated 9-20 June, 1262, and cf. nos. 183, 187. On 14 October, 1263, the Hungarians were exempted from the *subventio prestanda imperio Constantinopolitano* because of the terrible attacks they were suffering at the hands of the "gens impia Tartarorum" (*ibid.*, no. 421, p. 201). For various bulls relating to the Crusade in February and March, 1263 (from Urban IV's *regestum camerale*) see *ibid.*, I (1901), esp. nos. 310-32, pp. 84-91.

It will be well to recall that during these years, for more than a decade in fact, Venice and Genoa were caught up in their first great war (1256-1269/70), which helped destroy the security of Acre, Tyre, and the remaining Latin centers in the Holy Land (among other accounts, see Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1885-86, repr. Amsterdam, 1967, I, 344-54).

"to the prejudice of Christendom and the Roman Church."⁴⁸ By and large the chancery clerks at the Curia Romana drafted some eloquent documents, which accomplished little.

Collectors of crusading funds were sent into Castile and England as well as into France, but the sums gathered fell far short of the requirements for an expedition against Michael VIII. Disillusionment had diminished the laity's enthusiasm for the Crusade, which tended to rise and fall with passing generations, and the pope had cause for apprehension as well as disappointment in the poor response of the clergy (*privati commodi nimium tenaces, ac publici immemores*). It did no good for Urban to issue the solemn warning that the swollen pride of the Greeks had now given them the ambition *in elationis spiritu* to occupy the "principality of Achaia and the adjacent areas."⁴⁹ There is little reason to believe that even the Catholic clergy in Greece showed much more alacrity in furnishing funds to help preserve the Latin domains now threatened by Michael VIII, although the pope addressed the customary letters to the archbishops of Patras, Corinth, Athens, and Thebes, the bishops of Coron, Sparta, and Negroponte, and the abbots and other dignitaries of the imperiled Latin Church which lived so uneasily in the lands of Greek Orthodoxy.⁵⁰

The Venetians, however, were gravely concerned. They had suffered the severest loss in the Byzantine reoccupation of Constantinople. Their privileges had been part of the very structure of the Latin empire, and now quite naturally the statesmen on the lagoon were dreaming of the reconquest of the Bosphorus. Thus on 8 September, 1264, the Doge Ranieri Zeno wrote Urban IV:

⁴⁸ Belgrano and Imperiale, *Annali genovesi*, IV (1926), 44-45, and cf. pp. 50-51. On 19 January, 1263, in a bull dated at Orvieto the pope admonished the Genoese to give up their alliance with Michael VIII (Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, no. 182, pp. 72-73, and note nos. 228-30, 719-21, 851-52), which after their defeat by the Venetians at Sette Pozzi in the spring of 1263 (which led Michael to turn from Genoa to Venice) they seemed quite prepared to do—to the pope's pleasure since on 11 February, 1264, he was quite ready to relax the ban he had pronounced against Genoa (*ibid.*, II, no. 756, pp. 361-62).

⁴⁹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1263, nos. 19-21, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 98-99. The Crusade was also preached in Poland and in Aragon (Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, p. 403).

⁵⁰ Cf. Raynaldus, ad ann. 1263, no. 21, vol. XXII (1870), p. 98a.

It is not unknown to your Holiness how great, how honorable, and how excellent the empire of Romania was and is for the strength of Christendom, nor with what effort and expense as well as loss of life it was acquired and thereafter defended with the support of the Holy Roman Church: I do not insist upon this since it is more than clear to your Holiness and to the whole world. . . . For it is said that a manifesto [*edictum*] has gone out from the Apostolic See that whoever is willing to set forth in aid of the empire of Romania may have such indulgence [*venia*] granted to him as is conceded to those who cross the sea for service in the Holy Land. . . .⁵¹

The Venetians wanted to turn back the onward march of time and to embark once more on the Fourth Crusade.

It was at about this time that the attention of the Curia Romana was again directed to the farther East in search of allies to solve the mounting problems which threatened Latin Christendom everywhere in the Levant. For almost twenty years, ever since the mission on which Pope Innocent IV had dispatched the Franciscan Giovanni de Piancarpino in 1245 to the Great Khan Güyük (d. 1248), the Curia had had at least a tenuous diplomatic connection with the Mongols, which had excited the lively interest of such writers as Vincent of Beauvais and Matthew Paris.⁵² Rumor had it that in the summer of 1248

the pope had tried to enlist the aid of the Mongols against the Nicene Emperor John III Vatatzes.⁵³ A decade later (in 1258) Hulagu (Hülegü), the Mongol il-khan of Persia, destroyed the Abbasid caliphate of Baghdad, and seized five centuries of accumulated wealth. The Mongols slaughtered the inhabitants of the city, and pious Christians in the West saw the Moslem disaster as condign punishment from on high. There is no question but that the forces of Hulagu spared the Christians in their deadly ravages, and the Turkish princes and emirs of Syria and Anatolia looked to the future with misgivings.

In fact the Mongols quickly occupied Moslem Syria (by the spring of 1260), but their advance was soon stopped by the news which came of the Great Khan Möngke's death (in September, 1259) while he was engaged in the conquest of China. A war of succession in the Far East, whither the redoubtable Hulagu now betook himself, limited Mongol activity in the Levant. For a while the Christian kingdom of Cilician Armenia and the Latin principality of Antioch derived abundant profit and apparent security from the Mongol establishment. But the Mamluk victory over the Mongols at 'Ain Jālūt (on 3 September, 1260) immediately imperiled what remained of the Latin states in Syria and Palestine.

The Mamluk commander Baibars murdered the soldan, and was soon the undisputed master of Egypt as well as Syria. Baibars knew how to profit from the rivalry between Hulagu, il-khan of Persia, and the latter's cousin Berke, who ruled the Kipchak khanate of the Mongols in southern Russia. In opposition to Hulagu, Berke had assumed the role of protector of the Moslems in Syria whom the il-khan had assailed. Baibars was soon in correspondence with Berke and exchanged embassies with him in 1262-1263, at which time war broke out between the two Mongol rulers in the Levant.⁵⁴ At this point

⁵¹ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, 56-57. The Venetians especially feared a Byzantine attack upon Crete at this time.

⁵² On Christian-Mongolian relations in the mid-thirteenth century, see the remarkable study of Paul Pelliot, "Les Mongols et la papauté," *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 3rd ser., III (XXIII, 1922-23), 3-30; IV (XXIV, 1924), 225-335; and VIII (XXVIII, 1931-32), 3-84. The Mongol invasion of Hungary in 1241-1242 from the Kipchak khanate in southern Russia had stunned Europe although no western power made the slightest effort to assist King Bela IV (Denis Sinor, "Les Relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort d'Arghoun et de Bela IV," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III [1956], 42-46). There had apparently been no exchange of embassies between the papacy and any Mongol prince since 1254 (cf. Élie Berger, ed., *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, III [Paris, 1897], no. 8315, p. 557, doc. dated 29 August, 1254). The Mongols (Tatars) had of course fascinated Europeans for some time. Aubrey of Trois-Fontaines believed they had been ruled by Prester John, after whose death "they have done much evil on earth" (*Chron.*, ad ann. 1237-1239, in *MGH*, SS., XXIII (1874), 942-43, 946, with a reference to John de Plano Carpini [Piancarpino], on whom see Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 190 ff.). Incidentally Piancarpino knew, unlike some modern writers, that the Mongols were Tatars, not Tartars, ". . . Tattari appellatur, non Tartari" (Golubovich, I, 192). Despite the occasional hope entertained at the Curia Romana of effecting the conversion of the il-khan to Christianity, the Mongols of

Persia were in fact largely Buddhists (although some of them, to be sure, became Nestorians). On the Mongols in Persia and elsewhere in the mid-thirteenth century, see especially Bertold Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1955, pp. 39 ff., 59 ff.; on their religion, cf., *ibid.*, pp. 178 ff.; and on their relations with the papacy and other Christian powers in the West, *ibid.*, pp. 224 ff., 360 ff.

⁵³ Pelliot, *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 3rd ser., IV (XXIV, 1924), 330-31.

⁵⁴ Berke or Bärkä had been converted to Islam together with two of his brothers sometime between 1246 and 1253 (Paul Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, Paris,

Urban IV, some time before his death on 2 October, 1264, directed the letter *Exultavit cor nostrum* to Hulagu, who was believed to desire conversion to Christianity, and from whom an alliance was to be sought against the Mamluks, whose victory at 'Ain Jālūt was likely to conclude the increasingly inglorious history of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and cause the ouster of the Latin regime in Acre.⁵⁵

Despite Urban IV's anxiety for the Christians still in the Holy Land and his epistolary activity on behalf of a crusade against the Greeks for the recovery of Constantinople, he knew well that the papacy could not commit its resources to any such enterprise until the Hohenstaufen King Manfred of Sicily and southern Italy had been defeated. Manfred offered to assist the pope and the Latin Emperor Baldwin in an attack upon Michael VIII (and even to venture on to Jerusalem) in return for recognition of his right to the Regno. But this proposal, which appealed to the dispossessed Baldwin, was completely unacceptable to the pope, who was seeking in Charles of Anjou a champion to dethrone Manfred rather than looking for an opportunity to extend Hohenstaufen influence from Italy to the Bosphorus.⁵⁶ Thus, although the European chanceries received several papal appeals for a crusade against the Greeks, as we shall note in the next chapter, the pope himself began seriously to consider effecting the union of the Churches (if it could be done) with Michael VIII's co-operation as a first step against Manfred. However inconsistent in this respect, papal policy is easily explicable. Only time and political circumstance, then, could determine whether Michael was to find an ally or an enemy in the pope, but it was becoming increasingly clear that there would be no crusade against the Greeks unless and until Charles of Anjou became the king of Sicily.

The principality of Achaëa never recovered from the blow the Latin baronage sustained at

Pelagonia. The Emperor Michael VIII saw the opportunity to recover some of the lands the Greeks had lost as a consequence of the Fourth Crusade. For more than two years Prince William of Villehardouin remained Michael's prisoner, being unable to accede to the price the emperor fixed for his freedom, the surrender of the Morea in return for a money indemnity. The principality of Achaëa was a feudal state. Its usages were enshrined in the Assizes of Romania, to be written down something over half a century later. The rights of the baronial families of the Conquest were still fresh in mind.

Shortly after William's capture, according to the several versions of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, he informed Michael VIII in a dramatic audience:

My lord emperor, since you ask of me the land of the Morea, it is right that I tell you the whole truth and all that I shall be able to do, were I to remain a hundred years in your prison. The Morea is a land acquired by force of arms, held by right of conquest, which my father and the other good men of France who were his companions conquered, and they ordained and established among themselves, by laws and customs, that the land should pass on to their heirs. Therefore I should be doing a great wrong if I, who am a single person, should seek for the deliverance of my own body to disinherit all those who are to come up to the day of judgment. . . .

Prince William explained that he was merely first among his peers, whose lands he could not alienate, but that the emperor might hold him for ransom, "as is done in all the world where wars are fought," and that he and his vassals would pay, each according to his ability. If Michael would not accept a ransom in money, "we are in your prison, do with us what you will, for you shall never have anything else of us."⁵⁷

The fall of Constantinople on 25 July, 1261, moderated the intransigence of Prince William and also inclined the triumphant Emperor Michael to compromise. Within half a year William was released by guaranteeing the surrender to Michael VIII of the great Moreote fortresses of Mistra, Grand Magne, and Monemvasia. William had built Mistra and Grand Magne himself; he had taken Monemvasia after a three years' siege in 1248: thus the rights of the Latin

1949, pp. 50–51). Concerning the Mongol occupation of Baghdad (on 10 February, 1258) and its consequences, see B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran* (2nd ed., 1955), pp. 52 ff., 207 ff., and on the battle of 'Ain Jālūt, cf., *ibid.*, p. 57.

⁵⁵ Cf. Jean Richard, "Le Début des relations entre la papauté et les Mongols de Perse," *Journal asiatique*, vol. 237 (1949), 291–97. Hulagu's death in 1265 removed any possibility of his accepting Christianity.

⁵⁶ Cf. Martino da Canale, *Cronique des Veniciens*, chaps. CLXXXIX–CXCI, in *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (1845), 498, 500; Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 418, 422–32; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1953), pp. 143–44, 146–47.

⁵⁷ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, par. 314, pp. 116–17; *Greek Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 4256–4301; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, par 286, p. 64; and *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, p. 447.

barons of Achaea and the usages and customs of the principality were not violated when William surrendered for his freedom these products of his own enterprise. William also became, according to a Greek source, the Emperor Michael's vassal for the principality of Achaea,⁵⁸ as previously he had held his great fief of the Latin emperor, but soon after William's release Pope Urban IV freed him from any such obligations to Michael VIII on the grounds that they had been incurred under duress.⁵⁹

The cession of the Moreote castles, however, had first to be confirmed by a "parliament of dames" (in 1261), representing their imprisoned husbands, which the Princess Anna [of Epirus], the Greek wife of William of Villehardouin, had summoned to Nikli, because the Assizes of Romania provided that "if the prince has a castle on an enemy frontier, he cannot pledge it to the enemy or destroy it without the counsel and consent of his liegemen" (art. 19). The loneliness of the women prevailed over the dictates of military prudence, and the prince's concessions to the Greek emperor were ratified, despite the objections of Guy I of Athens. William of Villehardouin returned to his principality about the end of the year 1261, and soon found himself at war again, for two more years, with the Emperor Michael VIII. William's forces in the Morea directed two unsuccessful campaigns against the imperial troops (who included Turkish mercenaries), but he could hardly think of retaking the great fortresses which he had been obliged to give up to the emperor. The struggle had been "so bitter and bloody," according to Sanudo, "that one woman was married to seven husbands, one after the other, who were killed in this war. . . ."⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Pachymeres, I, 31 (Bonn, I, 86–88), adds the fortress of Geraki and the region of Kinsterna to Mistra, Grand Magne, and Monemvasia (which three places are specified as being ceded by William in the *Chronicles of the Morea* and Sanudo's *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 108, 116), on which see Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, I (Paris, 1932), 16–20. The future of Nauplia and Argos was apparently discussed by Michael VIII and William, but no action was taken concerning them, and they remained in Latin hands.

⁵⁹ Pachymeres, I, 31 (Bonn, I, 88, 11. 16–22); Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 306, 11. 18–21 (ad ann. 1255!); cf. Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, no. 131, pp. 46–47; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec*, I, 27–28; Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 231.

⁶⁰ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 118, and see Pachymeres, III, 15–17 (Bonn, I, 204–9); Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, I, 32–44, with refs., and vol. II (Athens, 1953), 60–62, 121, 133, 137, 337–38; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 231–34.

Pope Urban IV had given Prince William all the help he could, directing the Latin hierarchy in Greece to support the embattled barons of Achaea against the armed perfidy of the schismatic Greeks.⁶¹ Eastern affairs, even Moreote affairs, claimed the pope's attention to a larger extent than we can note here. Various letters and bulls were issued dealing with ecclesiastical and other problems in the Holy Land—for the fall of Acre was still almost thirty years away. Now we find the pope adjudicating a long-standing dispute between Archbishop Leonardo of Crete and the Venetian Signoria concerning certain rights and jurisdictions involving ecclesiastical personnel, tithes, and the possession of a number of monasteries and villages.⁶² Again, we see him receiving, "cum ingenti gaudio et exultatione ac honorificentia condigna," a Greek embassy from Michael VIII, to whom he now accorded the imperial title and to whom he would be glad to send his own nuncios (*apocrisarii seu legati nostri*) to discuss the union of the Churches and to receive the expression of Michael's filial devotion to the Holy See. In the meantime, however, Urban could only express distress at the reports which came to him from the Morea of the "persecutions, vexations, harassments, and pressures" to which Prince William was being subjected by Michael's forces. Indeed, these reports were delaying the dispatch of the papal legation to Constantinople. But Urban hoped for the speedy termination of these acts of hostility against the Latin principality of Achaea as well as for the reverent and honorable reception of his envoys at Michael's court. If Michael really wanted peace and concord, he should make his intentions manifest and he would find the Holy See receptive, for the union of Christendom was the pope's most earnest and heart-felt desire.⁶³

⁶¹ Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, nos. 231–32, pp. 102–3, docs. dated at Orvieto on 27 April, 1263.

⁶² Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, no. 233, pp. 104–8, doc. dated at Orvieto on 19 April, 1263; also in A. L. Tăutu, ed., *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X (1261–1276)*, Città del Vaticano, 1953, no. 5, pp. 7–14.

⁶³ Guiraud, *Registres d'Urbain IV*, II, no. 295, pp. 134–40, doc. dated at Orvieto on 18 July, 1263: ". . . ut ad unitatem redeatis catholicam totis clamamus affectibus et vos ut ad sinum matris ecclesie convertamini promptis desideriis invitamus . . ." (*loc. cit.*, p. 136b). Cf., *ibid.*, nos. 322–26, docs. relating to the projected papal legation to Constantinople, and *ibid.*, no. 748, for Michael VIII's (undated) letter to Urban IV, which was probably written in the spring of 1263 (see Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX [1962], 173, and cf. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 176 ff.). The letter of Urban IV to Michael VIII, dated 18 July,

Since the Greek attacks upon the Latin principality did not stop, however, Urban IV ordered renewed preaching of the crusade against the schismatic Greeks and Michael VIII (on 13 May, 1264),⁶⁴ but only ten days later (on 23 May) the pope wrote Michael that he was sending Bishop Niccolò of Cotrone and two Franciscans, Gerardo da Prato and Rainerio da Siena, on a mission to Constantinople to undertake negotiations looking toward the union of the Churches.⁶⁵ In another decade such negotiations would achieve surprising results.

After the Venetian defeat of the Genoese in the spring of 1263 in the naval battle of "Sette Pozzi" (the island of Spetsai, near Hydra),⁶⁶ Michael VIII saw the wisdom of re-establishing peace with the Venetians and renewing their economic privileges and exemptions. He was quite ready to exclude the Genoese from the franchises he had promised them at Nymphaeum. A treaty was drafted and accepted by Michael on 18 June, 1265,⁶⁷ but the doge of Venice did not ratify it, and Michael had to return to his dependence upon the Genoese in view of the growing menace of Charles of Anjou. The renewal of the Graeco-Genoese alliance, however, later prompted the Venetians themselves (on 30 June, 1268) to accept for five

years, *tam in mari quam in terra sine omni dolo*, a non-aggression pact with Michael, although the latter was no longer able to agree to the eviction of the Genoese, who had returned to Galata.⁶⁸

To protect himself from Latin aggression Michael VIII had recourse to the customary device of offering to discuss church union, as we have observed, which led Pope Urban IV, now seeking to destroy the Hohenstaufen King Manfred of Sicily and southern Italy, to abate his efforts against the restored Byzantine empire. Urban aided in the establishment of an uneasy peace between the emperor and the prince of Achaea. But he died on 2 October, 1264, and Clement IV succeeded him on the following 5 February. When the news of Clem-

1263 (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, no. 295), is also published in Tăutu, *Acta . . . (1261-1276)* (1953), no. 6, pp. 14 ff. Michael's undated letter to Urban (incorrectly assigned to the year 1264) is given in Tăutu, no. 10a, pp. 38-40. (Tăutu provides excellent texts of a number of documents relating to papal claims to jurisdiction over the eastern churches, as part of the *Fontes iuris canonici orientalis*, ser. III, vol. V, tom. I.) Cf. in general B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche* (1964), pp. 38-43.

⁶⁴ Guiraud, *Registres d'Urban IV*, II, nos. 577-79, pp. 292-94, docs. dated at Orvieto.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 848, pp. 405-8, doc. dated at Orvieto; also in Tăutu, *Acta . . . (1261-1276)*, no. 10, pp. 31-37.

⁶⁶ Belgrano and Imperiale, *Annali genovesi*, IV (1926), 51-52; Camillo Manfroni, *Storia della marina italiana . . . (1261-1453)*, I (Livorno, 1902), pp. 8 ff. Manfroni has also outlined the sources and discussed the results of the battle in an article "Sulla Battaglia dei Sette Pozzi e le sue conseguenze," *Rivista marittima*, 1900, pp. 225-49.

⁶⁷ For the Greek and Latin texts of the treaty see Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, 66-89, where the date is given by error as 8 June (*ibid.*, p. 62). The date 18 June is given in the treaty (pp. 67, 78); cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1934; Belgrano and Imperiale, *Annali genovesi*, IV, 65-66, on the difficulties of the Genoese with Michael VIII in 1264-1265, and *ibid.*, pp. 107-8, on their reconciliation in 1267, concerning which see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 206 ff. Cf. also W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Amsterdam, 1967), 432, with the inaccurate date 8 June, 1265.

⁶⁸ For the Latin text of the treaty, see Tafel and Thomas, III, 92-100: ". . . Item propter treguam istam non debent expelli Januenses de Constantinopoli vel imperio suo [i.e. imperatoris], sed erit securitas per ipsum imperium . . . inter Venetos nostros et Januenses . . ." (*ibid.*, p. 96). See also Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RSS*, XII-1, 313; Martino da Canale, *Cronique des Veniciens*, chaps. CLXXXVI-VII, 253 ff., in *Archivio storico italiano*, 1st ser., VIII (Florence, 1845), 496, 582 ff.; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1960; Thiriet, *Romanie vénitienne*, pp. 148-50; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 214-16, who exaggerates the extent to which "Venice was in the position of petitioner"; and H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 348-50, 356. This treaty was renewed in 1277 (Tafel and Thomas, III, 133-49), in 1285 (*ibid.*, III, 322-53), and on subsequent occasions. Despite these treaties a Venetian maritime court in March, 1278, asked for indemnity from the Byzantine government for an appalling number of acts of piracy allegedly committed by Greeks against Venetian subjects in the eastern Mediterranean during the 1270's (*ibid.*, III, 159-281).

The Genoese colony in Galata led a rather tumultuous existence (*Annali genovesi*, IV, 180), but was settled on the Bosphorus to stay. After the re-establishment of the Venetians in Constantinople their chief official was no longer called a podestà (*ἐξουσιαστής*), but a bailie (*παῖουλος*); until the fall of the city to the Turks the head of the Genoese colony bore the apparently more exalted title of podestà; representatives of other Italian states, heading the smaller communities of their countrymen in the Greek capital, were commonly known by the less important name of consuls (*ἐπίτροποι*). On the history of the Venetian office of podestà in Constantinople (1205-1261), see R. L. Wolff, "The Oath of the Venetian podestà," *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, XII (1952), esp. pp. 556 ff., and on the Greek names for podestà, bailie, and consul, cf. the remarks of Nicephorus Gregoras, IV, 5, 4 (Bonn, I, 97-98). A corrected list of the names of the Venetian bailies is given in P. Wirth, "Zum Verzeichnis der venezianischen Baili von Konstantinopel," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LIV (1961), 324-28, and esp. in Chryssa A. Maltezou, *The Status [Θεσμός] of the Venetian Bailie in Constantinople (1268-1453)* [in Greek], Athens, 1970, pp. 99-127, who also sketches the history and defines the functions of the office.

ent's accession reached Constantinople, presumably sometime in April, 1265, Michael VIII had the Byzantine rhetorician Manuel Holobolus prepare a letter to be sent to the new pontiff. One of the envoys whom Michael intended to make a bearer of the letter was the Greek Niccolò, bishop of Cotrone (Crotona), a faithful adherent of the Holy See. Holobolus's letter contains high praise of Niccolò. The other envoys had not yet been selected when Holobolus composed the text of the imperial letter; he left blank spaces for their names, but the blanks were never filled in, because the letter was not sent. Pachymeres informs us that Niccolò now lost favor at Michael's court and was banished to Heraclea in Pontus,⁶⁹ which may be the reason for not sending Holobolus's letter since, although the few lines lauding Niccolò could easily have been deleted, Niccolò's unique qualifications for the embassy could not readily be found in some other emissary. He was a Greek Catholic, thoroughly familiar with the tenets of Orthodoxy and wholly loyal to the papacy. In any event the letter which Michael actually sent Clement IV appears no longer to be extant, although its contents can be inferred from the pope's reply to it (dated 4 March, 1267).⁷⁰

Since the imperial letter to which Clement IV thus replied was partly based upon Holobolus's draft, perhaps some indication of the contents of this draft is in order: Michael VIII reminds the pope of the time when a glorious peace shone like the stars between the Greeks and Latins, but (alas!) the adverse winds of the evil spirit had dissipated that harmony. Now the relations of Greeks and Latins had become a grim tale of almost daily hostilities, the ruination of cities, the

depopulation of the countryside, the quest for plunder, and the untimely deaths of countless men. For years before Michael had reached the summit of imperial power, this tragic situation had been causing him anguish as each side appealed to the same Christ for assistance against the other. But, then, as soon as he had ascended the throne, he sent envoys to the late Alexander IV to try to repair this lamentable division of Christendom. When Alexander died, Michael had sent a similar embassy to Urban IV, appealing to him also in the cause of ecclesiastical and political peace. The learned Niccolò of Cotrone had served as the reverend emissary between Rome and Constantinople. There seemed to be high cause for rejoicing, and Michael was preparing a second embassy when Urban himself died. (Holobolus was not well informed concerning Michael's relations with the Curia Romana.) Now, however, Michael could thank God for Clement IV's elevation to S. Peter's throne, for the new pope's wisdom, charity, and moderation were well known. Michael urged Clement to work with all his might for the union of the Churches and to re-establish the sense of brotherhood between the Greeks and Latins, recalling all that the saints and martyrs and doctors had done for the Church in their opposition to heresy in the long and arduous past. Michael urged that a general council be summoned to remove all rancor and misunderstanding in order to help restore the needed union of Christendom. He promised his full co-operation in a joint quest for that peace and justice which Michael wished to prevail in his empire. Clement would thus win both the gratitude of heaven and the applause of mankind if his efforts succeeded. Michael himself, like a loving son, would approve and keep inviolate whatever was done in the sacred tradition of Christian orthodoxy.⁷¹

Despite the glowing tone of Holobolus's draft, which is quite in keeping with other communications of Michael VIII to the Holy See, Michael apparently did not take the initiative in resuming

⁶⁹ Pachymeres, V, 8 (Bonn, I, 360), and see Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 173-74. On the early life of Cardinal Guido Fulcodi [Guy de Foulques], up to the time of his election as Pope Clement IV, see Joseph Heidemann, *Papst Clemens IV: Eine Monographie, I: Das Vorleben des Papstes . . .*, Münster i. W., 1903.

⁷⁰ Cf. Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 435, 449. On Niccolò of Cotrone (in the toe of the Italian boot, just northeast of Catanzaro), see Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I (1906), 255-59; A. Dondaine, "Nicolas de Cotrone et les sources du *Contra errores Graecorum* de Saint Thomas," *Divus Thomas*, XXVIII (1950), 313-40; and Paolo Sambin, *Il Vescovo Cotrone Niccolò da Durazzo e un inventario di suoi codici latini e greci* (Note e discussioni erudite a cura di Augusto Campana, 3), Rome, 1954 (cited by Loenertz); and K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), p. 36, with references.

⁷¹ Holobolus's draft is published from Cod. Vindobonensis graecus 321, fols. 141v-43v, by N. Festa, "Lettera inedita dell' Imperatore Michele VIII Paleologo al Pontefice Clemente IV," *Bessarione*, ann. IV, vol. 6 (Rome, 1899-1900), 42-57, with the wrong date "tra il gennaio e il febbraio 1267," and see also "Ancora la lettera di Michele Paleologo . . .," *ibid.*, pp. 529-32. Cf. above, Chapter 4, note 40. Festa, p. 532, notes Holobolus's apparent errors in describing Michael VIII's negotiations with Alexander IV and Urban IV.

unionist negotiations after Urban IV's death. Rather it appears to have been Clement IV who did so. During the second year of Clement's pontificate there were papal *apocrisarii* in Constantinople, who had already returned to the Curia by 4 March, 1267, when the pope wrote in answer to the letter he had recently received from Michael.⁷²

In this letter Clement expressed cautious pleasure that Michael seemed ready to help end the Greek schism from Rome, but showed no tendency to accept theological or other compromises which could assist in the process. He also rejected the proposal Michael had made that a general council be convoked on Greek soil to deal with the problem of church union, but urged Michael to effect the union, after which Clement would be happy to consider a council which might adjust various differences existing between the Latins and Greeks. Observing that Michael had taken no step for almost three years to advance the ecclesiastical union which he advocated, Clement wrote that ". . . iam elapso fere triennio non curasti, nec per nostros apocrisarios . . . novissime ad te missos, qui apud te moram diutius contraxerunt, nobis misisti aliquid verbo vel scripto. . . ,"⁷³ making quite clear that Clement had himself recently (*novissime*) sent nuncios to Constantinople, who had remained there for some time (in 1266), and that Michael had made no reply to their overtures.

⁷² Clement IV's letter of 4 March, 1267, is given in Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (3rd ed., Quaracchi, 1931), 301–7, inc. "Magnitudinis tuae litteras . . . [recepimus]," and also in Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261–1276), no. 23, pp. 61–69, but little more than the archival identification (Reg. Vat. 32, fols. 199 ff.) appears in Édouard Jordan, ed., *Les Registres de Clément IV (1265–1268)*, 1 vol. in 6 fascs., Paris, 1894–1945, no. 585, p. 199. On the same date Clement also addressed a brief letter to the Greek Patriarch Arsenius (Wadding, IV, 308, and Tăutu, *Acta*, no. 24, pp. 69–70; Jordan, *Registres de Clément IV*, no. 586, p. 199). Arsenius had also expressed a desire "ad ecclesiarum, latinae videlicet et graecae, desiderabilem unionem," prompted of course by Michael VIII.

⁷³ Wadding, *Ann. Min.*, IV, 304. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 200–1 and note 37, cites this passage, omitting the all-important word *nec*, and mistakenly concludes that "Michael opened negotiations." He has been misled by Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 448–49. I follow the reconstruction of events in Loenertz, "Notes," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 175–76. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1267, nos. 72–79, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 214–17, gives an abridged version of Clement's letter of 4 March, 1267, but omits the passage cited above, the importance of which had obviously escaped him. On the further significance of this letter, see F. Vernet, "Le II^e Concile oecuménique de Lyon," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, IX, pt. 1 (Paris, 1926), col. 1382, and note Roberg, *Union*, pp. 58 ff.

either orally or in writing. Now, however, Clement incorporated in his letter of 4 March a rather detailed profession of faith, demanding its acceptance by Michael and the Greek clergy and people. This profession, which by and large provided the bases for the so-called union of Lyon (in 1274), included recognition of the Holy Spirit as *verus* . . . *Deus ex patre et filio procedens*; a pointed allusion to the *sacramentum eucharistiae ex azymo [confectum]*; as well as an uncompromising insistence upon the primacy of the Roman Church and the papal *potestatis plenitudo* with its right of doctrinal definition and appellate jurisdiction.⁷⁴

This letter was not easy for Michael VIII to answer. Events had been moving swiftly in Italy. On 26 February, 1266, the Hohenstaufen were defeated, and Manfred was killed, at Benevento. Charles of Anjou, the dauntless brother of Louis IX, became king of Sicily, and with the throne he soon acquired the Norman-Hohenstaufen designs upon the capital city on the Bosphorus.⁷⁵ The Byzantine historians George Pachymeres and Nicephorus Gregoras (as well as their western contemporaries) have a good deal to say of Charles of Anjou. Greek fear of the man and of his projects still rings in their lines. On the other hand fear of Michael VIII was great in the Morea, and Prince William welcomed the advent of a powerful French monarchy in southern Italy, a few days from his own domains, and he naturally gravitated toward it and sought its protection.

According to Pachymeres, as Charles's plans for an attack upon Constantinople seemed to be progressing, Michael became alarmed and addressed frequent appeals to Clement, some-

⁷⁴ Wadding, *Ann. Min.*, IV, 305–6; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1267, nos. 75–78, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 215–16.

⁷⁵ The literature on Charles of Anjou is of course too extensive for even partial citation here, but cf. Émile G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples*, Paris, 1954, pp. 42 ff., 103 ff., and see in general the excellent study of E. Jordan, *Les Origines de la domination angevine en Italie*, Paris, 1909, repr. New York, 1960, noting esp. pp. 405–19.

The documents relating to the Angevin conquest of southern Italy and the first half dozen years of Charles I's reign were collected by Giuseppe del Giudice, ed., *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I. e II. d'Angiò ossia collezione di leggi, statuti e privilegi . . . dal 1265 al 1309*, 2 vols. in 3, Naples, 1863–1902. Del Giudice could never fulfill the ambition of his title; his documents only come down into the 1270's, and contain very little about eastern affairs. The major collection of Angevin documents for this period is now of course that of Riccardo Filangieri and the Neapolitan archivists, *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, 20 vols., Naples, 1950–66, covering the years from 1265 to 1279.

times through Italian friars, who could travel safely through Charles's newly acquired kingdom. He urged the pope to dissuade Charles from his projected invasion of the Byzantine empire and not to allow Christians to make war on Christians. He affirmed "that they were also Romans whom the Latins call Greeks" (εἶναι γὰρ καὶ Ῥωμαίους, οὓς αὐτοὶ Γραικοὺς ὀνομάζουσι): they were subjects of the same Christ and members of the same Church as the Italians. The Greeks also recognized the pope (Michael said) as their spiritual father and accounted him "the very first among the bishops" (ἀρχιερέων ὧν ὁ πρῶτιστος). Michael promised that he would work to gather all Christ's flock into a single fold. At the same time, Pachymeres indicates, he took the mundane precaution of sending gold to the cardinals.⁷⁶ Michael was a realist, and always employed gold as his trump card in the diplomatic game.

When the sword of Islam fell heavily on the Armenians (in Cilicia) and Michael VIII expressed compassion for their plight in another letter to Clement IV, the latter replied on 17 May, 1267, mildly commending Michael's asserted affection for his fellow Christians in the East. Clement said that he would be less sparing in his praise if Michael were only giving some effect to his alleged affection (*si affectui responderet effectus*). Louis IX was going on a crusade with three sons, the pope wrote, and if the French attacked the Moslems on one side and Michael were willing to attack them on the other, the enemies of the faith could soon expect the end of their pestiferous sect. What Michael had written can be assumed from what Clement then goes on to say:

But if you say that you fear a Latin attack if you should leave your land stripped and almost unarmed by taking your army with you [on the crusade], the answer is not far to seek, for it is in your power to remove this fear by the roots—if you return to the unity of the Roman Church, assent to its salutary counsels, and are prepared humbly to obey the mandates the Church will make known. . . . What you have written can provide no excuse, namely that the blame must be fastened on the [Greek] prelates and clergy, not on you or your people, if the obedience owing to us is not forthcoming from them since it may be held as more certain than certainty itself [*certo certius*] that you exercise a far greater power over the prelates and clergy than is proper! You should place no trust in their error, contrary to God and all justice,

but you should shun them as schismatics if you cannot coerce them.⁷⁷

The East was on Clement IV's mind at this time. At the papal court in Viterbo on 24 May, 1267, after prolonged discussions, the harassed Prince William of Achaea surrendered the principality to Charles of Anjou with the full agreement of the titular Latin Emperor Baldwin II. In the preamble to the treaty, to which both William and Baldwin affixed their seals, William stated that his person and principality had been exposed to grave perils by the attacks of the "schismatic Michael Palaeologus, who causes himself to be called emperor," and that the Villehardouin lands in the Morea had been "in large part occupied." He claimed that he had sought aid of various European princes and magnates, but all in vain until "finally we have had recourse to you, most serene prince, lord Charles, illustrious king of Sicily." William had taken into account "the marvelous deeds of your ancestors and the proven worth of your most Christian lineage:" "We mark the valor of your person and are keenly aware that because of the special boon of energy and enterprise bestowed upon you by God, as well as the power and proximity of your kingdom, you have the quicker means not only to assist us and our said land but to meet also the perils of the Holy Land by the recovery of our territory and the defense of the orthodox [Latin] faith. . . ."

William professed to be as concerned for the common weal of Christendom and the Holy Land as for the protection of his own interests, and continuing his direct address to Charles in

⁷⁷ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1267, nos. 66–67, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 211–12; Jordan, *Registres de Clément IV*, no. 1201, p. 404, brief reference; Tăutu, *Acta . . .* (1261–1276), no. 25, pp. 71–72. Cf. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 204–5, who mistranslates Clement IV's significant observation to the Byzantine emperor "quod tu in praelatos et clerum longe maiorem quam deceat obines potestatem" (Raynaldus, p. 212). King Louis's dedication to the Crusade is too well known to require further comment here, and certainly the Curia Romana did all it could to assist him by grants of indulgences, tithes, and the like (Jordan, *Registres*, nos. 463–67, 508, 595, 841, 843, 1320, 1374, etc., and cf. nos. 812–14, 825–26, 838, 1117, 1211–12, etc.). On the preaching of the crusade in France from 1264 to 1270, see M. H. Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V . . .* (Studi e testi, no. 129), Città del Vaticano, 1947, repr. 1961, pp. 86–97, who very rightly observes of Clement IV that "ce pape languedocien, devenu si français, s'intéressa plus vivement aux événements d'Italie qu' à ceux de Palestine" (*op. cit.*, p. 91), making Charles of Anjou's "crusade" against the Hohenstaufen take the place of assistance to the threatened Latin states in the Holy Land.

⁷⁶ Pachymeres, V, 8 (Bonn, I, 359–60).

the preamble, he acknowledged that it was "obviously more advantageous for us to recover our said land through your efforts, with the help of God, and to hold it in the manner set forth below than to lose it irretrievably on our own. . . ." The Emperor Baldwin was agreed

that all our aforesaid land shall devolve upon you and your heirs or successors in this way—namely that one of your sons, whom the most holy father and lord Clement, by divine providence supreme pontiff of the Holy Roman and Universal Church, shall choose and designate, shall take to wife our daughter Isabelle, whom we have begotten of our wife Agnes, daughter of the Despot Michael, and after we have returned to our own land, we shall send Isabelle to you, to remain with your consort Beatrice, illustrious queen of Sicily, until the consummation of this marriage. We, however, are to hold throughout our entire lifetime all our territory and all our rights, and we are to have throughout our land all the jurisdiction and authority which we have at present, but with this exception, that we cannot make enfeoffments which will remain in effect after our death, beyond 14,000 hyperperi of land. . . .

Failing the birth of a son to Isabelle and her Angevin husband (she was to marry Charles of Anjou's son Philip, and they were to have no children), the Villehardouin principality was to pass irrevocably to the Angevins, for even if William should have a son (his expected child turned out to be a second daughter), the latter was to receive only one fifth of his father's lands as a fief under Angevin suzerainty. William was to secure compliance with the terms of the treaty from the Moreote barons and burgesses, and direct that after his death the castellans and sergeants of the castles and other strongholds should surrender their charges to Angevin appointees. In return for this extraordinary cession Charles of Anjou was to help William recover his lost possessions in the Morea, although the extent of Charles's military commitment is not specified in this connection. The treaty of 24 May was ratified at a consistory held in the papal chamber at Viterbo in the presence of the pope himself, fourteen cardinals, two archbishops, and various dignitaries and officials of both the Apostolic and Angevin courts.⁷⁸ Although William had stated in the pre-

amble to the treaty that he was looking to the needs of Christendom and the Holy Land as well as to his own interests, actually of course he had been forced to yield to the relentless ambition of Charles of Anjou, whose eyes beheld in the East the rising sun of an imperial future for himself and his family.

In Clement IV's rooms at Viterbo on 27 May, 1267, another treaty was negotiated between Charles of Anjou and the Latin Emperor Baldwin against "Michael Palialogus schismaticus imperatoris sibi nomen usurpans." Charles lamented the detachment of the Latin empire by schismatics from the body of the Sacrosanct Roman Church, and promised that within six (or seven) years he or his heirs would provide Baldwin or the latter's heirs with 2,000 men-at-arms (*equites armati*) to serve overseas for an entire year in the noble task of recovering the empire for its rightful lords of the family of Courtenay. This undertaking was made in the presence, the treaty states, and with the full approval of Pope Clement IV. Baldwin on the other hand surrendered to Charles full suzerainty and whatever other rights he might have over the principality of the Morea, so that the house of Anjou now became the *principales domini* of the chief Frankish state left in the Levant. Baldwin was also to grant Charles

all the land which the Despot Michael [of Epirus] by way of dowry or otherwise gave, transmitted, and granted his daughter Helena, widow of the late Manfred, onetime prince of Taranto, and which the same Manfred and the late Philippe Chinard, . . . the admiral . . . , held while they lived, and all the islands belonging to the said [Latin] empire . . . [south of Abydos] except four, namely Mytilene, Samos, Cos, and Chios,

which Baldwin was to reserve for himself and his imperial successors. Charles was to receive one-third of all the imperial lands which his troops might win; the other two-thirds, of course, as well as Constantinople and the four islands specified, were to be returned to Baldwin; but even here Charles might choose as his third whatever lands he wanted, including (if he should so wish) parts of the despotate of Epirus or of the kingdoms of Albania and Serbia.

⁷⁸ Jean Longnon, "Le Traité de Viterbe entre Charles Ier d'Anjou et Guillaume de Villehardouin, prince de Morée . . .," in *Studi in onore di Riccardo Filangieri*, I (Naples, 1959), 309–14, and Charles Perrat and Jean Longnon, eds., *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée (1289–1300)*, Paris, 1967, pp. 9–10, 207–11, give the text of the

important treaty of 24 May, 1267, which was unknown until 1942 and remained unpublished until 1959. Cf. also Longnon, "Le Rattachement de la principauté de Morée au royaume de Sicile," *Journal des Savants*, 1942, pp. 136–37, and *L'Empire latin de Constantinople* (1949), pp. 236–37.

Charles as active agent in the treaty further stipulated that

. . . if perchance the two persons with whom you [Baldwin and his heirs] have agreements with respect to the kingdom of Thessalonica should fail in their obligation under the same agreements, you are willing and consent that the kingdom of Thessalonica itself, the entire dominion, and all rights whatsoever which you hold in the same kingdom of Thessalonica . . . we and our heirs . . . may count in our aforesaid third and hold in full sovereignty [*plenissime*] if we should so wish.

Repetitive articles in the treaty of 27 May emphasized that everything which the house of Anjou acquired by this convention was to be held in full sovereignty, *in capite et tanquam principales domini*, free of all service and obligation of any kind to the Latin emperor. In fact, if Baldwin and his son Philip of Courtenay, who was to marry Charles's daughter Beatrice when she was old enough, should both die without heirs, the entire Latin empire with all its honors and appurtenances was to devolve upon the grasping Charles and the heirs of Anjou. No part of this treaty was intended to cause prejudice "to the ancient right which the Venetians are said to possess in the aforesaid territory of the empire." Finally, the high contracting parties both agreed to Clement IV's validation of the treaty, which had been ratified article by article in his presence in the long hall at Viterbo which in May looks from a height upon a green and smiling countryside.⁷⁹ Quite apart from the role which events had bestowed upon the pope in making him

the patron and protector of the Latin empire of Constantinople, Clement was undoubtedly pleased with the prospect of seeing Angevin arms transferred from the Italian countryside to the shores of the Bosphorus.

Prince William of Villehardouin rode at his suzerain's side in the famous battle fought near Tagliacozzo on 23 August, 1268,⁸⁰ with four hundred of those Moreote knights whom Louis IX had admired in Egypt twenty years before. In this battle Charles of Anjou defeated the sixteen-year-old Conradin, last of the legitimate Hohenstaufen, and Conradin's youthful companion Frederick of Baden, who after a brief imprisonment in the Castel dell'Uovo were tried and executed in the public square in Naples (on 29 October, 1268), so that Charles could sit securely on the Sicilian throne. Pope Clement IV died a month later (on 29 November), and during a papal interregnum of almost three years Charles was free to reorganize his new kingdom and to further his ambitions in Italy.

William of Villehardouin had been a faithful vassal, and Charles of Anjou sent him substantial assistance in the Morea. The principality of Achaëa had passed, however, for the duration of its checkered history into the orbit of Neapolitan politics, warfare, and intrigue, and most of those who served the Angevins in Greece were ill rewarded for their efforts. The victory at Tagliacozzo had brought Charles of Anjou to the fore as the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII's chief antagonist, with important consequences for both East and West.⁸¹ In the struggle that ensued the popes played a conspicuous part, especially Gregory X, who was to hold Charles in check, and Martin IV, who proved to be a fierce partisan of Angevin interests.

⁷⁹ Chas. Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs français*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon, 2 vols., Paris, 1826, I: *Recueil de chartes*, no. 23, pp. 455–63; Buchon, *Recherches et matériaux*, pt. I (Paris, 1840), 29–37; del Giudice, *Codice diplomatico*, II, 30–44, with notes; L. de Thallóczy, Const. Jireček, and E. de Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1913–18, I, no. 253, p. 732, with refs. to earlier publications of the treaty; Filangieri, *Registri della cancelleria angioina*, I (1950), 94–96, text severely abridged; Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 115, and Sanudo's so-called *Fragmentum*, *ibid.*, p. 173; W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I, 433–34; Zakythinos, *Despotat grec de Morée*, I (1932), 44–45; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 237; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 197–200. Beatrice of Anjou and Philip of Courtenay were not married until 15 October, 1273, some six years after the treaty of Viterbo. Baldwin II appears to have died a few days later, and Philip assumed the Latin imperial title (Longnon, *op. cit.*, pp. 242–43).

⁸⁰ Clement IV in a letter of 27–28 March, 1268, makes clear his high opinion of the services which William of Villehardouin, *princeps Achaye*, can render Charles of Anjou in the coming contest with Conradin (Jordan, *Registres de Clément IV*, no. 1336, p. 427).

⁸¹ Much attention has been given in recent years to the contest of Charles of Anjou and Michael VIII, for which see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 189 ff., 216 ff., etc., and Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers*, Cambridge University Press, 1958, pp. 136 ff., 157 ff., 174 ff., 186–234. Note also the succinct account of the background of events leading to the Sicilian Vespers in Erwin Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik (1261 bis etwa 1310)*, Jena, 1938, pp. 55 ff.

6. THE PAPAL INTERREGNUM, GREGORY X, AND THE SECOND COUNCIL OF LYON (1268–1274)

WITH the death of Pope Clement IV on 29 November, 1268, Charles of Anjou was relieved of the embarrassing restraint which the pope's interest in church union had imposed upon his plans for an expedition against Byzantium. But Louis IX's projected crusade still made it necessary for Charles to postpone his ambition, in furtherance of which he had made alliances with the rulers of Hungary, Serbia, and Bulgaria. The years 1269–1270 were marked by extensive diplomatic activity. According to the *Annali genovesi*, "in this year [1269] there came to the city [of Genoa] legates of the soldan of Babylon as well as envoys of the Tatars and of the Greek emperor to confer with the supreme pontiff and with the kings of France and Sicily. They stayed in this city for many days and thereafter left for the places (it is assumed) to which they had been sent. What they accomplished and what they proposed, were not generally known."¹

The soldan of Babylon was of course Baibars, the Mamluk ruler of Egypt (1260–1277), whose troops had ravaged the areas around Acre and Tyre in the spring of 1269. Late in the year Baibars had marched north to drive the Mongols (or Tatars) from Syria, where he spent the winter of 1269–1270. Baibars then returned to Egypt to prepare for Louis IX's expected crusade; since the Genoese were to provide most of the ships to transport the French army, it is not surprising that "legates of the soldan of Babylon" should have appeared in Genoa. The Mongol il-khan of Persia, now Hulagu's successor Abagha (1265–1282), had married a natural daughter of the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus. A Latin letter of Abagha to the pope, dated in 1268, is still extant.² But whatever the Mamluk, Tatar, or Greek envoys might have wished to propose or hoped to accomplish, their time would not be well spent at the Curia Romana, for following Clement IV's death the apostolic throne was vacant for three years (from 30 November, 1268, to

1 September, 1271), and factional strife in the Sacred College as well as the cardinals' difficulties with the municipal authorities at Viterbo made the conduct of business difficult. Charles of Anjou also interfered all he could, and Byzantine envoys had difficulty even reaching the Curia. Under these circumstances Michael VIII undertook to negotiate the union of the Churches with Louis IX, without whose permission Charles could hardly hope to launch his attack upon Byzantium.

It was apparently in the summer of 1269 that a Byzantine embassy arrived in France, to which Louis IX replied by a *contre-ambassade* at the end of the year. Neither able nor willing to settle the ecclesiastical issues involved, Louis referred Michael to the Sacred College. A letter of the College, dated 15 May, 1270, to Raoul Grosparmy, cardinal bishop of Albano and legate of the Apostolic See in France, states that Louis IX had recently informed the cardinals "that the magnificent Palaeologus, illustrious emperor of the Greeks, has explained to the king by envoys and letters that he himself as well as the clergy and people subject to his rule, desiring to return to the obedience of the Roman Church and themselves to be united in profession of the same faith, had sent various envoys and letters to this effect to the Apostolic See, of which some (detained along the way) did not reach their destination. Despite their frequent and humble demands for admission [to union], no satisfaction had so far been accorded their desires. . . ." Now the Greek emperor by repeating his embassies was insisting that Louis IX assume the role of arbiter, and "was promising that he would observe fully and inviolably whatever pronouncement the king might make in this matter." If Louis declined to act, said Michael, let him explain his refusal when he stood before the Supreme Judge at the last judgment. Nevertheless, Louis did not want to usurp the functions of the Holy See, according to the cardinals' letter, and had directed Michael to address his plea to the Sacred College, which now expressed approval of the royal prudence and humility.³

¹ L. T. Belgrano and C. Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, IV (1926), 115. Louis IX had taken the cross at Paris on 24 March, 1267.

² Cf. Gino Borghezio, "Un Episodio delle relazioni tra la Santa Sede e i Mongoli (1274)," *Roma: Rivista di studi e di vita romana*, XIV (1936), 363–64.

³ The letter of the Sacred College to Raoul Grosparmy, cardinal bishop of Albano, "datum Viterbii idibus Maii,

The letter to the cardinal of Albano mentions the efforts at church union which were made in Urban IV's time and rehearses at length those of Clement IV's reign when specific requirements were drawn up for the reception of the Greeks into the Roman Church. The writers of the letter did not intend so much to inform Albano of past proceedings as to put Clement's requirements once more into the record, especially the *verae catholicae fidei professio*, to which the Byzantine emperor, clergy, and people must subscribe *si vellent iuxta eius desiderium redire ad ipsius Ecclesiae unitatem*. Thereafter the Holy See might decide upon a place where a council could be convoked (as Michael VIII had wanted) "for strengthening the bond of love forever between the Latins and Greeks." The necessary declaration of faith (as prepared for the purpose under Clement

IV) was incorporated in the cardinals' letter, and they stated that the union of the Churches could be effected only if in a general synod of Greeks the emperor, patriarch, archbishops, bishops, archimandrites, abbots, and other prelates as well as the rest of the clergy and people publicly swore to the acceptance of the prescribed profession of faith and of the primacy of the Roman Church. Public instruments were to be prepared of these proceedings, some of which (duly sealed) were to be sent to the Holy See for preservation in the archives.⁴ On the same day (15 May, 1270) the cardinals wrote to Louis IX in almost the same words as to Albano, but added a statement of their fervent desire for ecclesiastical union and a word of caution against Greek hair-splitting and tergiversation.⁵

Louis IX's crusade faltered and failed on the burning sands around ancient Carthage during the summer of 1270. His brother Charles of Anjou negotiated with the king of Tunisia a rather favorable peace (favorable to himself at least), and was prepared to resume his plans for an attack upon the Byzantine empire.⁶ But his fleet was destroyed off the western coast of Sicily (on 22 November), and further misfortune met him in the election of the new pope after the long interregnum. Both Charles and the cardinals had found the interregnum profitable. On 1 September, 1271, however, since factional strife in the famous "conclave of Viterbo" had made the choice of a pope impossible, an electoral committee of six cardinals had chosen Tedaldo Visconti of Piacenza, the unordained archdeacon of Liège, who took the name Gregory X. For some years the Sacred College had been divided into an Angevin party, which wanted an ultramontane (pref-

A.D. MCCLXX, Apostolica Sede vacante," may be found in Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (3rd ed., Quaracchi, 1931), 338-41; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1270, nos. 3-5, vol. XXII (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), pp. 243-45; and A. L. Tăutu, ed., *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X (1261-1276)*, Città del Vaticano, 1953, no. 29, pp. 78-84, where it is incorrectly dated 13 May (in March, May, July, and October the ides fall on the fifteenth of the month). On the Graeco-French embassies, cf. Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 (1932), nos. 1967-68, 1971; Louis Bréhier, "Une Ambassade byzantine au camp de Saint-Louis devant Tunis (août 1270)," *Mélanges offerts à M. Nicolas Iorga* . . . , Paris, 1933, pp. 139-46; D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 223 ff.; and B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon (1274)*, Bonn, 1964, pp. 65 ff. Cardinal Bishop Raoul of Albano had been given the cross by Clement IV and sent to France, where he now served as *Apostolicae Sedis legatus* for the crusade (. . . *ob felicem promotionem ipsius negotii [Terrae Sanctae]*), and was to follow Louis IX to Tunis, where he died (Raynaldus, ad ann. 1269, nos. 7-8, vol. XXII, pp. 240-41, and ad ann. 1270, no. 10, vol. XXII, p. 247). Michael VIII sent a second embassy to Louis which found him dying before Carthage (Geo. Pachymeres, *De Michaelae Palaeologo*, V, 9, Bonn, I, 361-64, and cf. the "Primate," a monk of Saint-Denis, in M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XXIII, 73, on whom see Bréhier, "Une Ambassade byzantine," pp. 143 ff.). This embassy was headed, according to Pachymeres, by John Beccus, then *chartophylax* of Hagia Sophia (and later patriarch), and Constantine Meliteniotes, "archdeacon of the imperial clergy": its purpose was to persuade Louis to make his brother Charles desist from his designs upon Byzantium. Having once been John Beccus's secretary, Pachymeres was well informed. On the office of *chartophylax* and Beccus's mission to Carthage, cf. also Bréhier, "Jean XI Beccos," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, VII (Paris, 1934), cols. 335, 356. Raoul Grosparmy, incidentally, was of Norman origin, bishop of Évreux and chancellor of France under Louis IX.

⁴ Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261-1276), no. 29, pp. 79-84.

⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 29a, pp. 84-85, which Tăutu also misdates 13 May. Cf. Chas. J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, trans. H. Leclercq, VI-1 (Paris, 1914), 158-59; M. Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs et l'église grecque orthodoxe au XIII^e siècle (1231-1274)*, Cairo, 1954, pp. 141-42; and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1971, p. 56.

⁶ The years have done little to diminish the value of Richard Sternfeld, *Ludwigs des Heiligen Kreuzzug nach Tunis, 1270, und die Politik Karls I. von Sizilien*, Berlin, 1896. On the ill-fated French expedition to Tunis and Charles of Anjou's position thereafter, note the observations of the contemporary chronicler Saba Malaspina, *Rerum sicularum historia*, V, 1-2, 4-6, in Muratori, *RSS*, VIII (Milan, 1726), cols. 859-64, and on Saba's history, see Sternfeld's critique in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXI (Innsbruck, 1910), 45-53.

erably a French) pope, and an imperial party, which wanted to see an Italian pope and the imperial vacancy filled with a proper candidate. Like Urban IV and Clement IV, Gregory was elected by compromise, but this time obviously the Angevin party had lost out.

Tedaldo Visconti had been an ardent advocate of the Crusade, which provided the only issue on which the cardinals could reach an undivided opinion. Indeed, at the time of his election he was at S. Jean d'Acre in the Holy Land. A crusade, designed to check the fall of Latin fortunes in biblical lands, would be an impediment to an Angevin expedition against Byzantium. But Gregory, while attached to the memory of Louis IX, cared little for the ambitions of his brother Charles. On 10 February, 1272, the new pope reached Viterbo, where apparently he was ordained and consecrated. He was enthroned and crowned at S. Peter's in Rome on 27 March, and shortly thereafter took possession (the *possession*) of the Lateran.⁷ A papal reign of large importance had begun.

The times required a pope of strength and intelligence, free from partisan commitments. The Church was financially crippled, the question of the imperial election still unanswered, the future of Latin survival in the Holy Land very doubtful, and the reunion of the Churches still unlikely of achievement. The poets, trouvères and troubadors alike, encouraged prelates to pay the crusading tithes and feudal lords to take the cross. Almost two centuries had passed, however, since Urban II had inspired the French to go a-venturing into Syria and Palestine, and Gregory X lived in a generation which had little interest in helping eastern Christians, who would in any event rather live at parlous peace with the Mamluks than provoke them to an attack upon Acre,

Tyre, Tripoli, or Antioch. Who could blame them? Of course, all that was required to preach a crusade was strong lungs and the gift of eloquence, but it took a mountain of money and untiring effort to recruit men, find lodgings for them, transport them eastward, and lead them into battle with any hope of success. The crusaders had to leave their families behind and face the alarming perils of the sea. No sooner had they fought their battles in the East to protect the holy places and build securer lives for their orientalized cousins than the latter were eager to see them on their way back to Europe, to the estates they had sometimes mortgaged to the hilt to pay the Genoese or the Venetians for their passage to the Levant. The eastern Christians were right. There was no place in Syria and Palestine for their western cousins, who usually wanted to return home and wondered in retrospect what they had achieved anyway by all the expense, discomfort, and danger. Finally, the interplay of powerful forces in the Levant in the 1270's would complicate enormously the vast problems inevitably involved in launching a crusade of sufficient magnitude to recover the Holy Land.⁸

At the beginning of the century Innocent III had tried to resume papal leadership of the Crusade. But, now, while Baibars, the Mamluk "soldan" of Egypt, destroyed Caesarea and Arsuf in 1265 and took Safad in 1266, the popes were preaching a crusade against Manfred (and in the next generation would do so against Pedro III of Aragon). In 1268 the

⁷ On the background of Gregory X's election and his arrival in Italy, see the monograph of Ludovico Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X (1271-1276)*, Rome, 1959, chap. 1 and pp. 48-61 (Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici, fascs. 28-30). Cf. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (cited as *Concilia*), XXIV (Venice, 1780, repr. Paris and Leipzig: Welter, 1903), cols. 21 ff. In early November, 1271, before he left the Holy Land, Gregory delivered a sermon in the church of Sainte-Croix in Acre on the text (from the Psalms, 137: 6): "Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I remember thee not, Jerusalem" (Charles Kohler, "Deux Projets de croisade en Terre-Sainte [XIII^e-XIV^e siècle]," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, X [1903-4, repr. 1964], 410-11). The sermon was long remembered, and until his death Gregory preserved an almost hourly recollection of Jerusalem.

⁸ On conditions in the Levant at the time of Gregory X's election to the papacy (the relations and rivalries of the restored Byzantine empire, Mamluk Egypt, Mongol Persia, and the Mongol khanate of Kipchak or the Golden Horde, with its seat at Serai on the Volga, whose power extended throughout southern Russia and was constantly felt on the Danube), see Vitalien Laurent, "La Croisade et la question d'Orient sous le pontificat de Grégoire X (1271-1276)," *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXII (1945), esp. pp. 105-18; Denis Sinor, "Les Relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe . . .," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III (1956), 49-54. The major works on the Mongols in Persia and Russia are Bertold Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350*, Leipzig, 1939, 2nd ed. Berlin, 1955, and *Die Goldene Horde: Die Mongolen in Russland, 1223-1502*, Leipzig, 1943, 2nd ed. 1965 (the first scholarly book on the Mongols in Russia since Jos. von Hammer-Purgstall's *Gesch. d. Goldenen Horde in Kiptschak, das ist: der Mongolen in Russland*, [Buda]pest, 1840), and on the names of the Mongol khans and princes, see the posthumous work of Paul Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, Paris, 1949, pp. 10 ff.

Mamluks captured Jaffa in a single day (7 March), and took the Syrian capital of Antioch on 21 May when a garrison of some 8,000 surrendered.⁹ Actually the popes had lost control of the Crusade before they began to debase its purpose. When the era of the "political crusades" came, men were not easily inspired to fight the battles of French popes and their Angevin partners.

There was no lack of theorists, from Humbert of Romans and Fidenzio of Padua to Pierre Dubois, Ramón Lull, and the elder Sanudo, to advance plans and programs for the conquest or conversion of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, but they were read (when they were read) largely by high prelates and rich merchants sipping fine wines and munching confections. Like the pursuit of virtue the Crusade was widely regarded as a duty, a good work, but one could be virtuous by abnegation, by abstaining from sin. Crusading involved positive effort, expense, and self-sacrifice of major proportions.¹⁰ Neither the chivalry of Europe nor the clergy, however, was notably anxious for self-sacrifice in the later thirteenth century. As European society became richer, the towns more populous, the bourgeoisie more prosperous, the desire to enjoy life increased. Cooking improved, houses got larger, and there was some tendency to seek economic rather than spiritual salvation. Only such an extraordinary figure as Louis IX could inspire men, at least some men, to go crusading against the infidels in the East. For some time to come, the religious motive seemed spent, and yet Pope Gregory X would make a great effort—

at an oecumenical council—to revive the Crusade.

The storm which destroyed Charles of Anjou's fleet off the western coast of Sicily in no way diminished his ambition, and he continued his attempts to win the support of the Serbs and Bulgars, Albanians and Hungarians, for his eventual attack upon the Byzantine empire. By and large his efforts were not unsuccessful, especially among the Albanians, who recognized him as "king" and promised the succession to his heirs. In a royal charter dated at Naples on 21 February, 1272, Charles undertook the defense of the Albanians and pledged his maintenance of all their privileges, good usages, and customs.¹¹ Four days later Charles, "dei gratia rex Sicilie et Albanie, etc.," appointed Gazo Chinard, son of the eminent Philippe, his vicar-general in the new kingdom, and made one William Bernardi marshal of all the troops being sent to Albania.¹²

The alacrity and success with which Charles seemed to be pursuing his objectives alarmed Michael VIII, leading him to write to the high clergy and nobles of Albania in an effort to divert them from their Angevin allegiance. But the recipients of the letter turned it over to Chinard, and it was promptly transmitted to Charles, who on 1 September, 1272, wrote the Albanian clergy and nobles, congratulating them on their loyalty; warning them against Michael's fraudulent practices, "quibus, sicut nostis, alias vos decepit;" and urging them to advance the Angevin cause by waging a lively war against the Greek enemy.¹³ As Charles moved his troops into Durazzo, he stood at the head of the ancient Via Egnatia, the great military road which led through the center

⁹ Cf. W. B. Stevenson, *The Crusaders in the East*, Cambridge, 1907, pp. 338–41, and M. M. Ziada, "The Mamluk Sultans to 1293," in Setton, Wolff, and Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, II (1969), 735 ff., esp. pp. 748–49.

¹⁰ Cf. Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X*, pp. 68–73, on the poets and publicists, with a good bibliography; A. Lecoy de la Marche, "La Prédication de la croisade au treizième siècle," *Revue des questions historiques*, new ser., IV (Paris, 1890), 5–28, an analysis of Humbert de Romans' *Tractatus solemniss . . . de predicatione sancte crucis* (composed in 1266–1267), a very instructive but rather unexciting manual for preachers of the crusade. Humbert's well-known *Opus tripartitum* was written shortly before the Council of Lyon (1274), and was intended as a guide for the conciliar fathers' discussions of the Crusade, church union, and ecclesiastical reform (K. Michel, *Das Opus tripartitum des Humbertus de Romanis*, O.P., Graz, 1926). Cf. Roberg, *Union*, pp. 85 ff. On the widespread hostility to the Crusade at all levels of European society, before and during the reign of Gregory X, see P. A. Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade: A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda*, Amsterdam, 1940.

¹¹ L. de Thallóczy, Const. Jireček, and Em. de Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, I (Vienna, 1913), no. 269, p. 77. Charles speaks in this document of the *fides et devotio* which the Albanians showed the Latin Church. Cf. in general Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), pp. 232–35, and G. M. Monti, "La Dominazione napoletana in Albania: Carlo I. d'Angiò, primo re degli Albanesi," *Rivista d'Albania*, I (Milan, 1940), 50–58.

¹² *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, nos. 270–71, pp. 77–78, docs. dated at Naples on 25 February, 1272. On 7 April, 1272, in a dispatch from Trani, Charles upbraided the justiciar of Bari for his failure to send to Chinard *ballistarii et pedites lanzerii* as he had been ordered to do (*ibid.*, I, no. 273, p. 78, and cf. nos. 274 ff., letter after letter relating to the dispatch of men and provisions to Durazzo).

¹³ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 282, p. 80: ". . . nostra negotia contra hostes faciendo eis vivam guerram prosequamini viriliter et potenter."

of Thessalonica, whence the approach was open to Constantinople.

The Crusade, the reunion of the Churches, and the election of an emperor were the three chief issues which Gregory X faced upon his accession. All three problems were interrelated. There was a grandeur to medieval ideas, as to medieval architecture. The warriors of a united Christendom would subdue the infidel and rescue the Holy Land under the spiritual and temporal dominion of pope and emperor, and so the reunion of the Churches was as necessary as the selection of an emperor. A few days after his coronation in Rome (on 27 March, 1272), Gregory served notice on the Christian princes and prelates of his intention to convoke the fourteenth oecumenical council, which was to meet on 1 May, 1274, and at a consistory in April, 1273, he announced that he had chosen Lyon as the place of assembly.¹⁴

Gregory had already notified the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus of the coming council

by a long letter dated at Orvieto on 24 October, 1272, and had included for subscription by the Greeks the Latin "symbol" or profession of faith which (as we have seen) Clement IV had sent to Constantinople some years before. Gregory invited Michael to appear in person or to send *apocrisarii* . . . *cum potestate plenaria* to effect the union and remove the schism.¹⁵ Gregory also noted in his letter of the twenty-fourth the arrival in Orvieto of the Greek Franciscan, John Parastron, whom Michael had sent as an envoy to the Curia.¹⁶ Being *utriusque linguae doctus*, Parastron was a valuable intermediary between the Curia and Constantinople, where he had been a strenuous advocate of union.¹⁷ He had brought a letter from Michael in which the latter stated he had hoped that Gregory might stop off at the Greek capital on his way from the Holy Land to Italy since they might thus have considered together the means of ending the schism and preserving peace in Christendom.¹⁸

¹⁴ Curial letters of 31 March, 1272, informed the archbishop and clergy of Sens, Philip III of France, Henry III of England, and other princes and high clergy of the general council to be held on 1 May, 1274, "in loco quem licet ad presens subiceamus ex causa, competenti tamen tempore vobis curabimus intimare" (Jean Guiraud, ed., *Les Registres de Grégoire X [1272-1276]*, Paris, 1898-1960, nos. 160-61, pp. 53-56, and Abbé J. B. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire du diocèse de Lyon*, Lyon, 1905, nos. 1542-46, pp. 378-79). Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272, no. 24, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 281-83. The patriarch and the clergy of Jerusalem were informed of the projected council by a letter of 1 April (1272). On 13 April, 1273, Gregory X announced Lyon as the site of the council by the dispatch of letters to the princes and prelates of France, England, Scotland, Norway, Poland, Spain, Hungary, Germany, the Italian states, Romania (Greece), etc. (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, nos. 307-8, p. 118; J. B. Martin, *op. cit.*, nos. 1567 ff., pp. 384 ff.; and see Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1273, nos. 1 ff., vol. XXII, pp. 300 ff.). On the election of Gregory X and the whole history of the Second Council of Lyon from the Greek point of view, see George Pachymeres, *De Michael Palaeologo*, V, 11-22 (Bonn, I, 369-99). Cf. in general Belgrano and Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi*, IV (1926), 171-72, and V (1929), 16, 29; Dandolo, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938-48), 320-21; Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, in Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 135; and on the background of recent troubled events in Lyon, see the excellent study of M. H. Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise) et son temps*, Città del Vaticano, 1947, repr. 1961, pp. 110-33 (Studi e testi, no. 129). The famous Pierre de Tarentaise, later Pope Innocent V (1276), had been appointed by Gregory X to the archiepiscopal see of Lyon on 6 June, 1272, to effect the pacification of the city and archdiocese as a major step in preparation for the forthcoming council.

¹⁵ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 194, pp. 67-73; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272, nos. 25-30, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 283-87; Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261-1276) (1953), no. 32, pp. 91-100. On 25 October (1272) Gregory also wrote the Patriarch Joseph I (1267-1275) of Constantinople requesting his personal attendance at the Council with the necessary Greek clergy (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, no. 196, p. 74; Tăutu, *op. cit.*, no. 34, pp. 103-4). Michael VIII responded to the pope's letter with enthusiastic approbation (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, nos. 313-14, pp. 119-23, undated), and asked for security for his envoys: the Latin texts of Michael's letters are given also in Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (1931), 416-21, and brief summaries are provided by Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1553-54, p. 380, with refs. to the publication of the letters by Wadding, Raynaldus, Labbe, Hardouin, Martène, Sbaralea, etc.

¹⁶ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 194, p. 68b: ". . . dilectus filius frater Johannes de ordine Minorum a tua serenitate transmissus, bonus de terra longinqua nuncius, supervenit. . . ." Also in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272, no. 26, vol. XXII (1870), p. 284a, and Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (1931), 388; cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3 (1932), no. 1986, pp. 58-59, and in general Roberg, *Union*, pp. 95 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Pachymeres, V, 11 (Bonn, I, 371).

¹⁸ Guiraud, *loc. cit.*, and see esp. G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 283 ff., and II (1913), 415 ff.; cf. also Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs* . . . (1954), pp. 140 ff., 149 ff. Michael VIII was certainly doing his part to force union upon the Byzantine clergy (Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1 [1914], 162-63, 172-73), which provoked of course much opposition in Constantinople to the imperial policy. Among the opponents with whom Michael had to contend were his own sister Eulogia, the influential monk Job the Iasite, and the wavering Patriarch Joseph I (on whom see Louis Petit, "Joseph le Galésiot," in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VIII-2 [Paris, 1925], 1541-42). After a synod held in Constan-

On 25 October, Gregory appointed Jerome of Ascoli (the future Pope Nicholas IV) and three other Franciscans to accompany Parastron back to the Bosphorus to serve as papal nuncios at the imperial court in the expectation that Michael would respond favorably to the invitation to attend or be represented at the council.¹⁹ Angevin adherents at the Curia Romana lost no opportunity to advise the pope that the best way to end the schism was an expedition which would restore the Latin empire on the shores of the Bosphorus, but on 26 October (1272) Charles of Anjou directed his admiral in Brindisi to speed the Franciscans on their way and to assist them upon their return.²⁰ Gregory X was not a Frenchman, and he had no intention of pulling Angevin chestnuts out of the Balkan fire. On 5 November the pope authorized his nuncios to grant the Greek envoys safe-conducts to the Holy See (or to the council), in the likely event of Michael's dispatching them, and on the seventh he demanded that Charles of Anjou grant similar safe-conducts to the Greeks "in veniendo, morando et etiam redeundo."²¹ Gregory tried to establish peace between Ottokar II of Bohemia and Stephen of Hungary²² as well as among the north Italian towns, especially between Genoa and Venice. When Michael VIII tried to renew the Graeco-Venetian peace, Gregory warned the Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo not to do so without consulting the Holy See, and when the doge failed to reply, Gregory

admonished him in uncompromising terms.²³ Gregory feared that Michael might lose some of his deference for the Holy See and his enthusiasm for union if he could pursue a successful policy of neutrality or alliance with strong maritime states in the West.²⁴

An important purpose of the council was to be the moral reform both of the clergy and laity,²⁵ but this is not so much our present interest as Gregory X's eastern policy and plans for a crusade. There can be no doubt that, as the papal party journeyed north, it was the crusade which filled Gregory's mind. His activities during the preceding months make this fact abundantly clear.²⁶ Gregory reached Lyon with a large attendance between the third and the eighteenth of November (1273), and immediately dispatched another letter to Charles

tinople the Patriarch Joseph, to his subsequent regret, signed an "oath" that he would not accept the proposed union of the Churches until the Latins removed the *filioque* from the symbol (see Vitalien Laurent, "Le Serment antilatin du patriarche Joseph I^{er} [juin 1273]," *Échos d'Orient*, XXVI [Paris, 1927], 396–407, who publishes the text of the oath, which Job the Iasite actually composed).

¹⁹ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 195, pp. 73–74; Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261–1276), no. 33, pp. 100–2. Jerome of Ascoli and his companions were to accept the Greeks' profession of Catholic faith (the pope's letter is given also in Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 395–96, and cf. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1555, p. 381).

²⁰ Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 424–25. Gregory's letter dated 21 November, 1273 (referred to again below), reports the pressure exerted by the Angevin party at the Curia to deal with Michael VIII *via alia* than by diplomacy (*ibid.*, IV, 422–23).

²¹ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, nos. 197–98, pp. 74–75; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 396–97, 397–98; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1557–58, pp. 381–82.

²² Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, nos. 4–7, p. 3, docs. dated 5 May, 1272; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272, nos. 48 ff., vol. XXII (1870), pp. 293 ff.

²³ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272, no. 31, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 287–88, and cf., *ibid.*, nos. 40 ff.; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 162. On 12 July, 1273, Gregory confirmed a shaky peace between the Guelfs and Ghibellines (Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 335, pp. 129–32).

²⁴ Cf. Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 501; Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs* . . . , p. 152. Pope Gregory warned the Venetian government more than once against pursuing the *treugarum tractatus* with Michael VIII (Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, nos. 845–46, 927–29, pp. 346–47, 363–64, all letters undated). In view of the pope's objections Venice apparently delayed renewal of the peace or truce with Byzantium, but both sides were careful to avoid any serious break in their relations with each other. Between January and April, 1274, when Gregory had become convinced of Michael's acceptance of union on papal terms, he apparently ordered Tiepolo to conclude a truce with Byzantium (Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1632, p. 399).

²⁵ Cf. Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 194, p. 68: ". . . de generali morum reformatione, quorum deformatio in clero et populo nimis generaliter obrepissse videtur. . . ." Cf. F. Vernet, "II^e Concile oecuménique de Lyon," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (Paris, 1926), 1374–75. In late May and June, 1273, Gregory created five cardinals at Orvieto, among them Bonaventura, general of the Franciscans, and the Dominican Pierre de Tarentaise, later Pope Innocent V (Vernet, in *DTC*, IX-1, 1375; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1272 [sic], no. 68, vol. XXII [1870], p. 299, quoting Ptolemy of Lucca; André Callebaut, "La Date du cardinalat de saint Bonaventure [28 mai 1273]," in *Archivum Franciscanum historicum*, XIV [Quaracchi, 1921], 401–14). Cf. also Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1581, pp. 387–88.

²⁶ Cf. Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X* (1959), pp. 76–83, and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1273, nos. 35 ff., vol. XXII (1870), pp. 314 ff. During June and July, 1273, Gregory was in Florence, trying to make peace between the Guelfs and Ghibellines (cf. Fritz Kern, *Acta Imperii, Angliae et Francia [1267–1313]*, Tübingen, 1911, doc. no. 2, p. 2).

of Anjou (dated the twentieth), requesting full protection for the Byzantine envoys who would be traversing his domains in their way to the council.²⁷ On the following day (the twenty-first) he wrote again to Michael VIII, exhorting him to make every effort and preparation to assure the sincere declaration of ecclesiastical union and promising him that the Holy See would guarantee the security of his envoys.²⁸ A few days later he wrote Jerome of Ascoli and his fellow Franciscans that they should urge Michael to send the Greek delegation to the council with no semblance of delay, and that he wished Jerome and his companions themselves to attend the council.²⁹ Every papal epistle relating to the council or the crusade carried a note of urgency and determination, whether demanding financial subventions for the *negotium Terrae Sanctae* or seeking to allay hostilities among the states from which the necessary men and ships would have to be drawn. Gregory urged Edward I of England to hasten or postpone his coronation lest any elaboration of the ceremonies should delay or impede proper English attendance at the council.³⁰ As is well known, he directed the

great Dominican Thomas Aquinas to appear at the council; Thomas set out from Naples for Lyon at the end of January, 1274, taking with him the treatise he had composed at Urban IV's request on the errors of the Greeks. But Thomas got no farther than the Cistercian abbey of Fossanuova, near the castle of Piperno, where he died on the morning of 7 March (1274), not yet fifty years of age.³¹

After a general fast of three days, Pope Gregory X opened the first session of the Second Council of Lyon on 7 May, 1274, in the cathedral church of S. Jean.³² He preached on the text with which Innocent III had opened the Fourth Lateran Council (Luke, 22:15), "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you . . .," and he dwelt upon the threefold purpose for which he had convoked the present assembly—to recover the Holy Land, reunite the Greeks and Latins, and reform the Church.³³ Gregory faced an august gathering, which (like his opening text) recalled the grandeur of the Lateran almost sixty years before. Some 412 archbishops and bishops appear to have attended the Fourth Lateran Council. About half that number were present at the First

²⁷ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 316, p. 124, and cf. nos. 317–19; Tăutu, *Acta . . .* (1261–1276), no. 37, pp. 111–12; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1591, 1593, pp. 391–92. Amid the flood of papal letters demanding safe conducts for Michael VIII's envoys, we may also note those addressed to Philip of Courtenay, now Latin emperor of Constantinople (son of the late Baldwin II), and William of Villehardouin, prince of Achaea (Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 421–22, 423). Bernard Ayglier, the abbot of Monte Cassino, was to meet the envoys wherever they might land in the Sicilian kingdom, and conduct them to the pope (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, no. 317, p. 124). Although Gregory insisted that Charles of Anjou abstain from all acts of armed hostility against Byzantium, he did not object to Charles's continued preparations in Achaea and Epirus (cf. Thallóczy, Jireček, and Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I [1913], nos. 295, 297, 299, 304, 306, pp. 84–89), obviously to stimulate Michael's desire to see the union of the Churches effected (cf. Norden, *Papsttum u. Byzanz*, pp. 499–501, and Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* [1959], pp. 241, 256–57).

²⁸ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 315, p. 123; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 422–23; Tăutu, *Acta . . .* (1261–1276), no. 38, pp. 112–13; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1273, no. 50, vol. XXII (1870), p. 320; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1596, p. 392; cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 2002–2a, p. 62.

²⁹ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 320, pp. 124–25; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 424, doc. dated at Lyon on 25 November, 1273; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1597, pp. 392–93.

³⁰ Guiraud, *Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 327, p. 126, doc. dated 1 December, 1273; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1608, p. 394.

³¹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 29–30, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 332–33; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 168; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1611, p. 395, with pertinent refs. to the chroniclers. Thomas Aquinas was canonized in July, 1323 (Raynaldus, ad ann. 1323, nos. 64–66, vol. XXIV [1872], 234–36). He was proclaimed a doctor of the Church in April, 1567. On his death, cf. the edifying stories told in Fr. Thomas Pègues and Abbé Maquart, trans., *Saint Thomas d'Aquin: Sa Vie par Guillaume de Tocco et les témoins au procès de canonisation*, Toulouse and Paris, 1924, pp. 128 ff., 193–97, 198 ff., etc., 288–91, etc.

³² Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 1–3, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 321–23, with the notes to this edition; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 425, 434–35; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1647, p. 404; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 168 ff.; Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X*, pp. 82–84. By a slip of the pen M. H. Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V*, p. 147, puts the opening of the council on 7 March. The article of Augustin Fliche, "Le Problème oriental au second concile oecuménique de Lyon (1274)," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XIII (1947), 475–85, is rather slight.

³³ Antonino Franchi, ed., *Il Concilio II di Lione (1274) secondo la Ordinatio Concilii generalis Lugdunensis*, Rome, 1965, pp. 67–73, esp. p. 72 (Studi e testi Francescani, no. 33). The *ordinatio concilii* had appeared in nine editions (from 1612 to 1890) before that of Franchi, most notably under the wholly misleading title of *Brevis nota eorum quae in secundo concilio Lugdunensi generali acta sunt*, in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 61–68, and in the present context note col. 63AB.

Council of Lyon. According to the Bohemian chronicler Martin of Troppau (d. 1278), who had close connections with the Curia Romana, there were 500 bishops, sixty abbots, and about a thousand lesser prelates in attendance at the Second Council of Lyon. Later chroniclers may vary the figures, but they all derive their information directly or indirectly from Martin. Heinrich Finke showed many years ago that Martin's estimate is much exaggerated, although recent writers seem generally to disregard Finke's more likely establishment of the number of bishops present at Lyon as between 200 and 300.³⁴ It was still a grand affair.

The second session of the council was held on 18 May; the third on 4 June; the fourth and fifth on 6 and 16 July respectively; and the sixth and last session on 17 July. Although James I of Aragon was the only king to appear in person, royal envoys came from France, England, Germany, Sicily, Cyprus, and even from Mongol Persia. The Byzantine envoys of Michael VIII were present at the last three sessions. Among the cardinals at Lyon three would soon be elected to the papacy themselves—Pierre de Tarentaise (Innocent V), Ottobono Fieschi (Hadrian V), and Petrus Hispanus of Lisbon (John XXI), all of whom were to wear the tiara and die within little more than a single year. Albertus Magnus, bishop of Regensburg, was there, and so of course was Cardinal Bonaventura, as well as some of the best-known members of the thirteenth-century episcopacy, including Guillaume I Durand of Mende, Étienne Tempier of Paris, and Eudes Rigaud of Rouen. The master of the Templars came, and a representative of the Hospitallers.³⁵

³⁴ Heinrich Finke, *Konzilienstudien zur Geschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Münster, 1891, pp. 4–8. Cf. Martin of Troppau (*Oppaviensis*), *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, in *MGH, SS.*, XXII (1872), 442: "Numerus autem prelatorum, qui fuerunt in concilio, 500 episcopi, 60 abbates et alii prelati circa mille." This is the source from which in one way or another various similar or larger figures enter the works of Guillaume of Nangis, Ptolemy of Lucca, Bernard Gui, Martin of Fulda, Henry of Herford, John Iperius's *Chron. S. Bertini*, and others. Cf. the rather uncritical note of Mansi, who does not know Martin of Troppau, in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 1, vol. XXII (1870), p. 322, and for the dependence of later chroniclers upon Martin's work see, in addition to Finke's *Konzilienstudien*, M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 3 ff., but Laurent, *ibid.*, p. 147, seems not to know Finke's *Konzilienstudien*, and accepts the exaggerated figures usually given by the chroniclers (cf. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1648, pp. 405–6).

³⁵ Cf. *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*,

Gregory employed the interval between the first and second sessions of the council to extract from the higher clergy of each province a promise to give a tithe of all ecclesiastical revenues for six years to help rescue the Holy Land. Just after the second session he received a most encouraging letter from the nuncios he had sent to Constantinople, which he directed to be read publicly in the cathedral, and Cardinal Bonaventura preached on a singularly appropriate text from Baruch (5:5): *Exsurge, Jerusalem, sta in excelso et circumspice ad Orientem*. . . .³⁶ The plight of the Holy Land was the major consideration of the second session of the council (on 18 May), and Gregory introduced a detailed project for the crusade with an impassioned allocution. He had not merely heard of the ineffable atrocities of the Saracens, he said, but he had seen them with his own eyes (. . . *non tantum audivimus sed oculis nostris aspeximus* . . .), and the liberation of the Holy Land was a matter of concern to all Catholics (. . . *prefate terre liberatio tangere debet omnes qui fidem catholicam profitentur* . . .). In addition to the six years' tithe to be levied on

pp. 69–70, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 62, 133; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 169; Vernet, in *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (1926), col. 1376; and cf. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1649 ff., 1763. Jerome of Ascoli, who arrived from his mission to Constantinople in time to attend part of the council, was made a cardinal by Nicholas III in 1278, and was himself elected pope as Nicholas IV a decade later (in February, 1288).

³⁶ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 3, vol. XXII (1870), p. 323; *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*, pp. 75–77, 106, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 63E–64A. The letter which Gregory had read in the cathedral was sent by Jerome of Ascoli from Leukas; it is dated 5 April, 1274 (Finke, *Konzilienstudien*, pp. 119–20; Od. van der Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermissionen* . . . [Werl in Westfalen, 1934], pp. 251–52; and Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs* . . . [1954], pp. 168–70). Jerome was on his way to Lyon, traveling with the Byzantine envoys—one of their two galleys sank in a storm off Cape Malea, with considerable loss of life and the loss also of rich gifts intended for the pope. Jerome informed the pope that Michael VIII had subscribed to the symbol and recognized the primacy of the Holy See. He also identified the Byzantine envoys who were being sent to Lyon, "qui nobiscum de Constantinopoli recesserunt, sed tempestate valida insurgente cum galea in qua erant CC et XIII viri viam ligni in qua nos eramus non sequentes alisi ad Nigropontis scopulos perierunt . . ." [but the galley went down off Cape Malea, not the island of Negroponte]. Nos Constantinopoli in dominica, qua cantatur Letare [11 March, 1274], recessimus et applicavimus vix V die mensis Aprilis in capite Leucarum [Leukas]. Ad vestram sanctitatem cum illis tribus apocrisariis festinamus . . ." (Finke, van der Vat, and Roncaglia, *loc. cit.*). Cf. Pachymeres, V, 17, 21 (Bonn, I, 384–85, 396–97).

ecclesiastical incomes and other financial imposts, Gregory required that the secular authorities collect a penny a year from every Christian within their jurisdictions. Every penny would count, and was to be used for the recovery of the Holy Land. Corsairs and pirates were to be excommunicated, together with the false Christians who sold the Saracens arms, iron, timber, ships, and other such items of military contraband. Indeed, the pope forbade all Christian shipping in Saracen waters in the Levant for six years not only to weaken Islam but to increase the transport to be made available for the crusade. He declared an inviolable peace of six years in Christendom, and decreed the usual plenary indulgence for those who were going to participate in the crusade.³⁷

In a consistory held on 6 June Gregory decided the long-disputed question of empire in favor of Rudolph of Hapsburg, whose representatives immediately confirmed various undertakings which Otto IV of Brunswick and Frederick II had given the papacy earlier in the century.³⁸ Recognition of Rudolph seemed to solve one of the problems which Gregory had faced upon his accession. At the third session (on 4 June) a dozen canons were promulgated. Since no one was certain when the Byzantine representatives would arrive, no date was set for the fourth session, and the bishops and

prelates were allowed to withdraw from Lyon to a distance of up to six leagues (about fifteen miles), so that their recall might be easy and their return quick.³⁹ Having provided a titular head for the German empire, Gregory now turned to deal with the Greek empire.

The Greek delegation arrived at Lyon on 24 June, and was met according to the custom of the Curia Romana by the chief officers of the pope's *famiglia* or household and of course by those of the cardinals.⁴⁰ The three chief members of the Greek delegation were the former Patriarch Germanus [III], the Metropolitan Theophanes of Nicaea, and the Grand Logothete George Acropolites, whose historical account of his own times unfortunately comes to an end well before the date of the council. Accompanied by their honorific escort, the Greeks were conducted to the archiepiscopal palace, where Gregory stood in the great hall to receive them and give them the kiss of peace. They declared that they had come to Lyon to render obedience to the Sancta Romana Ecclesia, accept the Latin Catholic symbol, acknowledge the primacy of the Holy See, and convey to the pope an imperial chrysobull in which their emperor also professed the Catholic faith in the form and formulae required of him (ἡ ὁμολογία τῆς πίστεως, ἣν διδάσκει καὶ ὁμολογεῖ καὶ κηρύττει ἡ ἁγία ἐκκλησία τῆς Ῥώμης).⁴¹

Most of the discussions at Lyon took place behind the scenes (as usually happens at synods and councils), but Graeco-Latin agreement on the articles of faith was of course a foregone conclusion. On the feast of Saints Peter and Paul (29 June), Pope Gregory celebrated mass before a great ecclesiastical assembly, and the epistle, gospel, and creed were all sung in Greek as well as Latin. Bonaventura preached

³⁷ See Finke, *Konzilienstudien*, pp. 11–15, with the Latin text of Gregory's allocution, *ibid.*, pp. 113–16, and cf. Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X*, pp. 84 ff., who deals especially with Gregory's financial preparations. At the second session (18 May), the author of the *Ordinatio*, as given in Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*, p. 74, states "quod dominus papa non fecit sermonem, sed allocutionem tantum. . . . Qua allocutione finita, lecte sunt constitutiones, scilicet, *Zelo fidei* . . ." [which constitutions or canons, as Finke, *op. cit.*, pp. 11–12, has shown, related to the levying of the crusading tithes]. Cf. the bibliography assembled by Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1768, pp. 420–22.

³⁸ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 5–12, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 323–26, and cf., *ibid.*, nos. 44–61, pp. 337–44. Some two months after the council Gregory made a formal declaration of Rudolph's accession to the imperial throne (by a bull dated 26 September, 1274): ". . . cum fratribus tamen nostris nuper deliberatione praehabita, te regem Romanorum de ipsorum consilio nominamus" (*ibid.*, no. 55, p. 340). The papal decision was of course highly offensive to Alfonso X of Castile and Ottokar II of Bohemia, the former being Rudolph's chief rival for the throne and the latter Rudolph's chief enemy (cf. Hefele-Leclercq, VI-1, 170–71, with refs., and M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 152–54, with refs., and cf. pp. 192–97). The sources are collected in Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1783–84, pp. 426–27.

³⁹ Cf. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (1931), 434, and see the *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*, p. 78: ". . . dominus papa . . . dedit licentiam omnibus prelatibus quod possent exire Lugdunum et elongare se usque ad sex leucas" (and not to a distance of "six miles," as stated in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 172). Cf. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1788, p. 428.

⁴⁰ *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, p. 79, and "Brevis nota," in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 64C.

⁴¹ Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 434–35, 436 ff.; *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 79–81, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 64CD; Tăutu, *Acta . . . (1261–1276)* (1953), no. 41, pp. 116 ff.; cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 14, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 326–27, partial text; and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3 (1932), nos. 2006–9, pp. 63–64. (Different readings of minor importance in these transcriptions need not detain us.)

on the righteous faith of Rome and the necessity of church union. When the Nicene symbol or creed was sung in Greek, the Dominican William of Moerbeke (the translator of Aristotle and Archimedes), who later became Latin archbishop of Corinth (1278–1286), and the Franciscan John Parastron, who had apparently been serving as the chief interpreter at the council, joined in the singing. The *filioque* clause was sung three times, and the Patriarch Germanus III, the Metropolitan Theophanes of Nicaea, and the “logotheta” Acropolites all joined in, after which they also sang in Greek the *laudes solemnes* in the pope’s honor.⁴²

A few days later, on 4 July, the good citizens of Lyon and the members of the Curia were astonished to witness the arrival of an embassy from Abagha, the Mongol il-khan of Persia, who sought an alliance with the Christians

against the Moslems in the Levant. The envoys had made their long journey safely under the guidance of a few Dominican friars. The letter which they brought the pope, the cardinals, and the conciliar fathers began with a grandiloquent boast of all the conquests which the Mongols had made throughout the Middle and Near East; stressed Mongol generosity to and protection of Christians; and proposed a confederation with Christendom against Islam, which would of course place the city and kingdom of Jerusalem in Christian possession, but obviously under Mongol suzerainty.⁴³ The envoys dwelt on the interest which Hulagu, Abagha’s father, had shown in Christianity. Hulagu had bared the secrets of his heart to the Dominicans at his court, telling them things he had never told others; in fact the envoys claimed that Hulagu would have been converted and baptized “if God had not allowed his removal from our midst because of our own sins.” (One wonders whether the Dominicans did not prepare this alleged *littera quam misit*

⁴² *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 82–83, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 64–65A, the author of which, oddly enough, incorrectly places the feast of SS. Peter and Paul on 28 June; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 446–47; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1634, 1638–39, 1790–95; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-I, 173; M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 155–56; Roncaglia, *Les Frères Mineurs . . .*, pp. 171–72. On Nicholas III’s election of William of Moerbeke as archbishop of Corinth (on 9 April, 1278), see Martin Grabmann, *Guglielmo di Moerbeke, O.P., il traduttore delle opere di Aristotele*, Rome, 1946, pp. 52–56 (*Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*, vol. XI, no. 20), and on Moerbeke as a translator, see L. Minio-Paluello, in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, IX (New York, 1974), 434–40. The bull nominating Moerbeke to the see of Corinth may be found in the Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 39, fol. 6^r, of which there is a notice in Jules Gay and Suzanne Vitte, eds., *Les Registres de Nicolas III (1277–1280)*, fasc. 5 (Paris, 1938), no. 20, p. 8. The text has apparently not been published, but (in my opinion) it contains nothing of importance beyond fixing the date of Moerbeke’s elevation to the see: “. . . te ordinis fratrum predicatorum penitentiarii nostrum predicte Corinthiensis ecclesie de fratrum nostrorum consilio et apostolice plenitudine potestatis in archiepiscopum preficimus et pastorem et tibi munus consecrationis nostris manibus duximus impendendum firmam spem fiduciamque tenentes quod dicta Corinthiensis ecclesia per diligentiam et industriam tuam laudabilia in spiritualibus et temporalibus suscipiet incrementa.”

As observed by D. M. Nicol, “The Byzantine Reaction to the Second Council of Lyons, 1274,” in *Studies in Church History*, VII, eds. G. J. Cuming and D. Baker, Cambridge, 1971, p. 114, the oft-repeated tale that Theophanes of Nicaea stopped singing at the *filioque* clause, presumably to catch his breath, is untrue. All told, the Greeks, including Theophanes, sang the creed with the *filioque* insertion five times at the council (Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*, pp. 83, 91–92, 111, 114). Actually Theophanes was a unionist and a supporter of Michael VIII, whom he later served as envoy on the unhappy Byzantine mission which Michael sent to the Curia Romana in 1280–1281.

⁴³ Gino Borghezio, “Un Episodio delle relazioni tra la Santa Sede e i Mongoli (1274),” *Roma: Rivista di studi e di vita romana*, XIV (1936), 369–72, publishes the text of the (undated) letter of credence which the Mongol envoys brought to Gregory X and the Sacred College at Lyon on behalf of Abagha, who is referred to in the letter in the third person: “Tandem volens concordiam cum latinis et confederationem contrahere specialem omnes civitates eorum et castra, terras et possessiones quiescere precepit et ne lederentur a suis districtissime prohibuit et ordinavit. Insuper civitatem sanctissimam Ierusalem cum toto regno eiusdem contulit et in possessionem poni fecit, sicut noverunt omnes christiani ultra mare et religiosus frater David [the Dominican who had conducted the Mongol mission to Lyon, and who has just been described as ‘nuntius domini patriarche Ierosolimitani et domini regis regni eiusdem et Cypri, qui nos usque ad presens sacrum concilium incolumes laudabiliter conduxit,’ which sounds almost as though this portion of the letter was written after the arrival of the mission in Lyon!], qui omnia ista una cum fratribus eiusdem ordinis qui cum eo erant studiosius procuravit” (*op. cit.*, pp. 370–71). Cf. *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 84, 92, 96, 97, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 65B, 66C, 67C, and 68A; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 447, 449; Gatto, *Il Pontificato di Gregorio X*, pp. 93–95, who erroneously refers the appearance of the Mongols to 14 July instead of 4 July (on which cf. the *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, p. 84). Gatto also incorrectly places a session of the council on 14 July: there were sessions on 6, 16, and 17 July, but not on the fourteenth. Cf. in general M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 156–60, with refs.; Giovanni Soranzo, *Il Papato, l’Europa cristiana e i Tartari*, Milan, 1930, pp. 219–22 (Pubbl. Univ. Catt. Sacro Cuore, ser. 5, vol. 12); and especially the detailed account of B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche* (1964), pp. 135 ff.

rex Tartarorum ad Concilium Lugdunense, as the letter is entitled in the Vienna MS. of the text.⁴⁴) Now Abagha followed in his father's footsteps, showing Christians the same and even greater consideration. Both father and son had released the [Christian] captives they had found on their campaigns, stripping the shackles from them and having them conducted to the safety of the Mediterranean. Of all this the Dominican friar David could speak, for he had accompanied the Mongols on such campaigns.

Therefore we make known to all who live under the sun that our most puissant king Abagha, wishing to form an alliance and maintain a firm peace with all the Christian subjects of the Sacrosanct Roman Church, has been pleased to send us as his solemn envoys to the presence of the holy Apostolic See and the present most holy Council, as is stated in letters in the Mongol and Latin languages, authenticated by his seals, which we have presented to the most holy father, the Supreme Pontiff, in the presence of the venerable lord cardinals and the other prelates in attendance. . . .⁴⁵

There is no reason to assume a sincere attachment to Christianity on Abagha's part. A Christian alliance against the Mamluks would be highly advantageous, and one of the Mongol envoys and two other members of the mission requested and received baptism at the hands of the Dominican Cardinal Pierre de Tarentaise (later Innocent V), and on the following 13 March (1275) when the Mongols were getting ready to return to Persia, Gregory X wrote the il-khan that he had welcomed his envoys with pleasure. Gregory had prayed and he did pray, *corde contrito et humiliato spiritu*, that God, the true light illuminating the soul of every man born into the world, would grant Abagha and his people the will to recognize the truth and in the exaltation of the Christian faith to seek their own salvation. As for the crusade, Gregory stated that before Christian armies appeared in the East a papal mission would in its turn inform the il-khan's court in

Persia and provide the Mongols further means, if they would but hearken to the message, of achieving the salvation the pope coveted for them.⁴⁶

The fourth session of the Second Council of Lyon was held on Friday, 6 July. The Greek envoys took their places on the pope's right, after the cardinals, and listened to a sermon by Cardinal Pierre de Tarentaise, who was so conspicuous in the activities of the council. The pope then expressed his joyful satisfaction in the free return of the Greeks to the obedience of the Roman Church,⁴⁷ and had Latin translations of the important Greek letters read to the assembly—Michael VIII's long letter containing the Roman symbol (*Credimus sanctam trinitatem, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum . . .*), a letter of acceptance of the Catholic faith with an expression of filial obedience from Michael's eldest son Andronicus, and a letter from the Greek hierarchy praising Michael's zeal for church union as well as recognizing the union and the primacy of the papacy.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 21–23, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 329–30; Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 80; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1 (1914), 174, 180; and cf. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 2nd ed. (1955), pp. 228–29, 233.

⁴⁷ According to the author of the *Ordinatio Concilii*, Gregory emphasized that the Greek profession of the Latin faith and recognition of papal primacy were rendered "nichilque temporale petendo" (ed. Franchi, p. 86, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 65D, and cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Conciles*, VI-1, 174), but prevention of the Angevin attack upon Byzantium was obviously a *quid pro quo* of some importance, as everyone at the council realized, including the contemporary author of the *Ordinatio*, who adds that much doubt could be entertained on the score of the Greeks' willing acceptance of the Latin symbol—*de quo multum dubitabatur*.

⁴⁸ Tăutu, *Acta . . .* (1261–1276), nos. 41 ff., pp. 116 ff. The Greek hierarchy recognized both the union and the primacy in general terms (Tăutu, *op. cit.*, no. 42, pp. 125–26). The letter of Andronicus, to which Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 14, vol. XXII (1870), p. 327, alludes, is not "aujourd'hui perdue," as stated in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, VI-1, 176, but appears in Tăutu, *op. cit.*, no. 44, pp. 130–31, and had already been published by Léopold Delisle, "Notice sur cinq manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et sur un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de Bordeaux, contenant des recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples" [a notary in the papal chancery famous for the style of his letters], *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale . . .*, XXVII, pt. 2 (Paris, 1879), doc. III, pp. 158–59. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), p. 262, also seems to imply that Andronicus's letter is lost.

The Roman symbol (up to the words *Haec est vera fides catholica . . .*, for which see the text in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 70; Hefele-Leclercq, VI-1, 175, note; Tăutu,

⁴⁴ MS. Vindobon. 389, fol. 114v, of which Borghezio, *op. cit.*, furnishes a facsimile. The text may have been written by the notary Rychaldus, who served the Mongols as Latin interpreter, and to whom reference is made in the document in the first person (*ibid.*, fol. 115v; Borghezio, *op. cit.*, pp. 371–72): ". . . quorum minimus eram Rychaldus, notarius . . . interpretes latinorum. . . ."

⁴⁵ MS. Vindobon. 389, fol. 115v, ed. Borghezio, *op. cit.*, p. 372. According to the author of the *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, p. 92, Abagha's letter was read at the council by a chaplain (Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 66C).

George Acropolites, historian, soldier, and diplomat, now stepped forth, the center of attention. There must have been a solemn stillness in the church as he began to read:

I, George Acropolites, grand logothete, envoy of our lord the Greek emperor, Michael Ducas Angelus Comnenus, possessing the latter's full mandate for what follows, do entirely abjure all schism. The statement of faith to which we have subscribed, as it has been fully read out and faithfully set forth, in my said lord's name I do recognize to be the true, holy, catholic, and orthodox faith. I accept it. In my heart and with my lips I profess it, and I do promise that I shall preserve it inviolate, as the Sacrosanct Roman Church truly holds, faithfully teaches and preaches it, and I promise that I shall never at any time abandon it or deviate from it or disagree with it in any way whatsoever. . . .

Acropolites then solemnly accepted the primacy of the Roman Church and pledged obedience thereto both on his emperor's behalf and on his own.⁴⁹

op. cit., pp. 117–18; Vernet, "II^e Concile oecuménique de Lyon," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 [1926], cols. 1384–85) is essentially the profession of faith of Pope Leo IX (as given in the letter "Congratulamur vehementer" to Bishop Peter of Antioch, dated 13 April, 1053, in H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, ed. C. Rahner, Freiburg-im-Breisgau and Barcelona, 1952, nos. 343–48, pp. 169–71), which is almost that still employed by question and answer in the consecration of bishops in accordance with the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, formerly ascribed to the non-existent Fourth Council of Carthage (398), but of which Caesarius of Arles (502–542) is believed to have been either the author or the compiler (*cf.* the notes in Denzinger-Rahner, pp. 72, 214–15). Since the *Statuta* contain nothing concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, Leo IX took care to affirm, "Credo etiam Spiritum Sanctum . . . a Patre et Filio procedentem . . ." (on which *cf.* Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 1387).

⁴⁹ *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 88–90, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 73–74; Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261–1276), no. 48, p. 134; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 18, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 328–29; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire* (1905), nos. 1802–8, pp. 432–34, with extensive bibliography; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 177–78; Roberg, *Union*, pp. 147–48. According to instructions which Pope Innocent V gave a papal embassy going to Constantinople two years later (on 23 and 26 May, 1276), George Acropolites could not produce a written document authorizing him officially to abjure the schism in Michael VIII's name, and so Innocent directed his envoys to receive a personal oath from Michael accepting the Latin symbol and recognizing the Roman primacy (E. Martène and U. Durand, eds., *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, VII [Paris, 1733], no. 34, cols. 254D, 257E; M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append. 5, no. 153, p. 480, and *cf.* p. 160; note also Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 133E, and Hefele-Leclercq, VI-1, 177). The Greek emissaries had presented

When Acropolites had finished, the pope began the *Te Deum* in a loud voice and, an eye-witness informs us, remained standing without his miter "with great devotion and in abundant tears." It was probably the supreme moment of his papacy. Again he preached, briefly this time, on the text with which he had opened the council (from Luke, 22:15), *Desiderio desideravi hoc pascha manducare vobiscum*. Then the Greek envoys descended from the dais to take their places behind the cardinals in the high stalls set up in the nave of the church, and the pope began to intone *Credo in unum Deum*, in which the whole council joined. Then the envoys sang it in Greek, being joined by the Greek clergy from southern Italy and Sicily, who had been in communion with Rome since the memorable Council of Bari in 1098. They sang the *filioque* clause twice. It was after this that the pope had the letter of Abagha, the il-khan of Persia, read to the council, and then tentatively set Monday and Tuesday, 9–10 July, for the next sessions of the council.⁵⁰

On Saturday, 7 July, Gregory showed the cardinals the constitution he had prepared *super electione Romani pontificis*, concerning which there had been a good deal of dissension in the Sacred College. Gregory insisted upon renewing the decrees of certain of his predecessors, especially Alexander III, to the effect that after a novena of mourning for a dead

a letter of credence to Gregory X upon their arrival in Lyon, the text of which is given in Tăutu, *op. cit.*, no. 45, pp. 131–32, and Delisle, "Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibl. Nationale*, XXVII-2 (1879), doc. iv, p. 159: "Et quicquid tractaveritis et quicquid affirmaveritis et confirmaveritis, attendit hoc imperium meum ostensione presentis precepti imperii mei. . . ." But since specific mention is not made in this commission of either the Latin symbol or the Roman primacy, the legal minds in the Curia apparently considered its phraseology inadequate to establish the binding validity of Acropolites' oath. On the chronology of Gregory X's letters, as contained in Bérard of Naples' collection of papal correspondence (in Bordeaux MS. 761), see Palémon Glorieux, "Autour des Registres de Grégoire X," *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, V-3 (1951), 305–25, and *cf.*, below, Chapter 7, note 1.

⁵⁰ *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 90–92, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, 66D, the latter incorrectly dating Monday as 11 July. It may be observed that since the time of Innocent IV's negotiations in 1249–1251 with John III Vatatzes and the Nicene Patriarch Manuel II the papacy had been ready to concede that the Greeks need not expressly mention the *filioque* clause in the symbol provided they did not deny the dogmatic teaching implicit in the clause (*cf.* Georg Hofmann, in *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XIX [1953], 64).

pontiff, the cardinals should assemble in conclave on the tenth day, and if after three days in conclave they should have failed to elect a new pope, their food would be reduced to a single plate (*ferculum*) served them each morning and evening. If after five days of this coercive diet, they still had not elected a pope, they would receive nothing but bread and wine and water until they could announce to a waiting world the name of the new pope. During the conclave the cardinals were to receive nothing from the Camera Apostolica or from any other ecclesiastical source.⁵¹ Gregory's own election had been preceded by an interregnum of three years, and he was determined that such a scandalous vacancy should not again leave Christendom without its chief pastor.

The general feeling of satisfaction among most of the conciliar fathers at Lyon was sadly diminished on Sunday, 15 July, when Cardinal Bonaventura died, *homo eminentis scientie et eloquentie, vir quidem sanctitate precipuus, . . . benignus, affabilis, pius . . . Deo et hominibus dilectus*. He was buried the same day at the Franciscan convent in Lyon in the presence of the pope, the members of the Curia, and the grieving fathers of the council. Pierre de Tarentaise, cardinal bishop of Ostia, preached on the text (from II. Kings [II. Sam.], 1:26): "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: Very pleasant hast thou been unto me. . . ."⁵² The Greeks had translated Bonaventura's name as Eutychios, and the charm of his personality had impressed them as much as his learning. He was canonized in 1482 under Sixtus IV, and proclaimed a doctor of the Church by

Sixtus V in 1588, both pontiffs recalling his extraordinary services at Lyon.⁵³

It was at the fifth general session of the council, on 16 July, that Pierre de Tarentaise baptized the three Tatars, who were clad (*more Latinorum*) in scarlet for the occasion. After the ceremony Pope Gregory entered the church, and fourteen conciliar constitutions were read to the assembly. The pope then spoke of Bonaventura and of what an "inestimable loss" the Church had suffered in his death; he ordered that all prelates and priests *per totum mundum* should say a mass for his soul and another for the souls of those who had died in attending the council. But now the hour was getting late, and continuance of the affairs of the council was set for the next session, to be held on the following day. The sixth and last session, then, was held on Tuesday, 17 July, and two more constitutions were read publicly. The pope now addressed the assembly for the last time. Again he recalled the three reasons for convoking the council. Plans had been made for the Crusade (the *negotium Terre Sancte*), and union had been effected with the Greek Church, but he said "that the prelates were causing the ruin of the whole world" (*quod prelati faciebant ruere totum mundum*). To these he gave a solemn warning. If they did not reform themselves, he would impose reform on them. Only worthy men were to be ordained as parish priests, and they were to reside in their parishes. Other matters remained, of course, for the council had not been able to deal with everything that required attention, but the pope would seek *remedia opportuna* for such problems. After the accustomed prayers, the pope gave the benediction, and Cardinal Ottobono Fieschi, later Pope Hadrian V, pronounced the *Recedamus in pace*, "and thus the council was dissolved."⁵⁴

Three months later, on 1 November, 1274, Gregory published the constitutions or canons of the council, thirty-one in number, all of which (with the exception of the nineteenth) were duly entered in the *Sextus decretalium*.

⁵¹ See the second canon of the council, in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 81–86, and also in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 182–86. Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 24–27, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 330–31. Gregory had to do a good deal of lobbying to get this canon through the council, so determined was the opposition of the cardinals (*Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 93–94, and in Mansi, XXIV, cols. 66DE–67A), on which see M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 161–62. Gregory's decree of papal elections (*Ubi periculum*) would of course deprive the cardinals of the profitable opportunity to administer the affairs of the Church during an interregnum. Hadrian V annulled Gregory's decree in the midsummer of 1276, and John XXI confirmed Hadrian's act (Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1951–52, p. 473).

⁵² *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, p. 95, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, col. 67AB; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV (1931), 452–53; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1810–11, pp. 436–37; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 28, vol. XXII (1870), p. 332; Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, II (1913), 87–88.

⁵³ Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 179–80; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 450; and Franchi, *Concilio II di Lione*, pp. 160–62, whose work is valuable for all aspects of the second Council of Lyon.

⁵⁴ *Ordinatio Concilii*, ed. Franchi, pp. 96–100, and in Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 67–68; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 33, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 333–34; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1812 ff., 1844 ff.; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 180–81.

Besides reasserting the procession of the Holy Spirit and providing for immediate conclaves to choose a new pope, the canons dealt with various questions of election to ecclesiastical office, administration, discipline within the Church, benefices and ecclesiastical property, the mendicant orders, the liturgy, usury, excommunication, and the interdict.⁵⁵

The Greek envoys apparently left Lyon soon after the dissolution of the council. According to Pachymeres, autumn was far advanced before they got back to Constantinople, accompanied by papal envoys.⁵⁶ The chief papal envoy was Bernard I Ayglier, abbot of Monte Cassino, who would explain to the Emperor Michael VIII how the union had filled Latin hearts with joy (according to the credential letter dated 28 July, 1274, which Bernard bore from the Curia to Constantinople); the abbot would also negotiate a truce between Michael on the one hand and the Latin Emperor Philip of Courtenay and King Charles of Sicily on the other, of sufficient length (*treguae sufficientis temporis*) to allow a papal legate, who would be sent to Constantinople later, to arrange a full treaty of peace (*foedera concordiae plenioris*). The envoy would also explain why the pope was not sending the legate immediately. In a matter of such importance "unconsidered haste" was to be avoided.⁵⁷ The Franciscan John Parastron was directed by a letter of the same date (28 July) to return with the papal envoys to Constantinople.⁵⁸

Abbot Bernard carried three letters with him to the Byzantine court, all bearing the same date as his own credentials (28 July)—in the first letter the pope informed the emperor that Mother Church was exulting in the union and rejoicing "that she had found her lost drachma" (*se drachmam deperditam invenisse*); in the second he urged the young Andronicus [II] to help maintain the union, for which God would reward him; and in the third letter the pope wrote the Greek hierarchy that God had reserved the act of union for their time, and they must prove worthy of the boon by preserving it and protecting their flocks from the mortal illness of schism.⁵⁹

Religious peace did not bring secular peace, but as far as Michael VIII was concerned, Charles of Anjou had become a far less dangerous enemy since he could not don the crusader's mantle in attacking the Byzantine empire. Since the Greeks were now sons of Mother Church and good Christians (*τῆς ἐκκλησίας υἱοὶ καὶ Χριστιανοί*), as Pachymeres says, Gregory X would not tolerate such an attack in the guise of a crusade.⁶⁰ Indeed, Michael VIII now took the offensive, and moved boldly into Albania. The two opponents had little difficulty in anticipating each other's moves. Charles repaired the castle of Durazzo and stocked it with food (by orders of April, 1274, and constantly thereafter),⁶¹ granted fiefs to

⁵⁵ E. L. Richter and Emil Friedberg, eds., *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1955, II, pp. 936 ff., *et passim*; Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 81–102; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1, 181–208; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 32, vol. XXII (1870), p. 333; Finke, *Konzilienstudien* (1891), pp. 8–11; Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1900, pp. 457–61; Vernet, in *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (1926), cols. 1379–81, 1383.

⁵⁶ Pachymeres, V, 21 (Bonn, I, 397–98), who seems to think the council was held in Rome!

⁵⁷ Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 461, "datum Lugduni, V Kal. Augusti, [pontificatus nostri] anno tertio." Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, no. 20, vol. XXII (1870), p. 329, and Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, nos. 1848–53, pp. 446–48. On the embassy of Bernard Ayglier (Ayglerio) to Constantinople, cf. also M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V* (1947, repr. 1961), pp. 268–69.

⁵⁸ Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I (1906), 288–89; Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261–1276), no. 54, pp. 141–42. According to the Franciscan chronicler Nicholas Glassberger, *Chronica*, in *Analecta Franciscana*, II (Quaracchi, 1887), 88 (and cf. Golubovich, *op. cit.*, I, 289), John Parastron died in 1275 in Constantinople.

⁵⁹ For the texts of the three letters, see Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, IV, 460, 461–62; Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 78–80; Tăutu, *Acta* . . . (1261–1276), nos. 51–53, pp. 138–41; and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1274, nos. 19–20, vol. XXII (1870), p. 329, who quotes selections from the letters. Abbot Bernard was successful in his mission to Constantinople (Martin, *Conciles et bullaire*, no. 1899, p. 457), negotiating a one year's truce between Michael VIII and the houses of Anjou-Courtenay which was to last from 1 May, 1275, to 30 April, 1276 (cf. Delisle, "Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," *Notices et extraits des MSS.*, XXVII-2 [1879], 134, 163, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3 [1932], no. 2014, p. 65).

⁶⁰ Cf. Pachymeres, V, 26 (Bonn, I, 410).

⁶¹ Thallóczy, Jireček, and Sufflay, *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I (1913), nos. 316–17, p. 92, and cf. nos. 326–28, 344, 347–49, 358, etc. Before 29 September, 1275, Michael VIII's troops had reached "ad vineas civitatis Durachii" (*ibid.*, I, no. 348). Avlona was equally well protected (*ibid.*, I, nos. 336–37, 352, 355–56, 366–67, etc.). On 21 February, 1272, Charles of Anjou had declared himself king of Albania, on the significance of which see Gennaro M. Monti, "Ricerche sul dominio angioino in Albania," in *Nuovi Studi angioini*, Trani, 1937, pp. 565 ff. (R. Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Puglie, Documenti e Monografie, n.s., vol. XXI).

trusted soldiers,⁶² and made interminable inquiries concerning the state of his lands and the condition of his troops after various Greek attacks.⁶³ Achaea was almost as much a cause for concern as Albania.⁶⁴

The Second Council of Lyon hardly achieved a union of the Churches. The pope and the emperor had come to terms with each other. To Michael VIII, Byzantium was worth a Latin mass, and he had yielded to Gregory X on the doctrinal authority of the papacy. Although generations of theological discussion and controversy make it clear that the members of the Greek hierarchy did understand the implications of the Latin profession of faith, it is equally clear that they accepted it only under constraint, and it is useless to suggest that "il n'est pas douteux non plus que les évêques étaient libres de résister au désir impérial."⁶⁵ There was no free discussion or formal approval of the Latin symbol at Lyon. Obviously the Roman Church required no approval of the faith to which it had adhered for centuries. The formula was read and accepted by the imperial envoys, but they were not representative of the Byzantine Church, let alone the other Orthodox Churches. The Lyonesse "union" was fruitless. Negotiated in fear, prolonged under duress, it would be abandoned by Andronicus II when the Angevin threat had passed.

In the meantime Michael VIII deposed the Byzantine Patriarch Joseph I, who retired into the monastery of the Peribleptos near Anaplous. On 16 January, 1275, the feast of S. Peter in Chains, as Pachymeres informs us, the union of the Churches was pronounced in the palace chapel. Nicholas of Chalcedon said mass. The epistle and the gospel were read in Latin as

well as Greek, and Gregory X was declared to be "supreme pontiff of the Apostolic Church and oecumenical pope" (ἄκρος ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πᾶπας). The declaration of union caused extreme dissension on the Bosphorus, with the Greeks becoming divided into pro- and anti-Latin factions and entertaining more animus for one another than they did for the Latins.⁶⁶ Michael now named the famous John Beccus, the unionist *chartophylax* (chancellor), as Joseph I's successor (on 26 May), and Beccus was enthroned on the following Sunday (2 June).⁶⁷ He had the support of two ecclesiastical luminaries, the archdeacons George Metochites and Constantine Meliteniotes. If a few conspicuous members of the clergy in the capital supported the union for political or other reasons, certainly the Byzantine provincial episcopate did not, nor did the monks who were a powerful force in Constantinople and elsewhere in the empire. The aristocracy was also hostile to even theoretical subjection to Rome.

The Emperor Michael's own sister Eulogia was so anti-unionist as finally to support the idea of a Bulgarian-Mamluk attack upon Byzantium with the pious objective of destroying the newly re-established empire in order to preserve the purity of the Orthodox faith. Obviously there were many problems. Always looking for allies, Michael had married his natural daughter Maria to Abagha, the il-khan of Persia,⁶⁸ who was constantly planning hostilities against the Mamluks. Although Abbot Bernard of Monte Cassino negotiated a year's truce between Michael and the now united house of Anjou-Courtenay, Michael knew that

⁶² *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 319.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, I, nos. 323, 330, 332, 339, and cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 258 ff., with refs.

⁶⁴ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 345. The documents published by Riccardo Filangieri and the Neapolitan archivists, *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, 20 vols., Naples, 1950-66, show that through the years Charles of Anjou sent much aid to Achaea (cf. g. vol. VII [1955], pp. 91, 105-6, 107, 108, 183, 184, 201, 244-45; vol. VIII [1957], 4, 18, 31, 48, 51, 84, 249, 283, 289; vol. IX [1957], 30, 32, 166, 211, 212, 299; vol. X [1957], 28-29, 38, 52, 78, 240; vol. XI [1958], 51, 71, 110, 206, 208, 214, 249, 250; vol. XII [1959], 40, 105, 115-16, 120, 129-30, 135, 139, etc.; etc.). On one occasion Charles dispatched funds "pro negotio Achaye quod multo imminet cordi nostro" (*ibid.*, VIII, 84).

⁶⁵ F. Vernet, "II^e Concile oecuménique de Lyon," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (1926), col. 1388.

⁶⁶ Pachymeres, V, 22-23, 28 (Bonn, I, 398-401, 413-14).

⁶⁷ Pachymeres, V, 24 (Bonn, I, 402-3 and ff.).

⁶⁸ Cf. Pachymeres, V, 24 (Bonn, I, 402). Maria had married Abagha shortly after the death in 1265 of his father Hulagu, to whom she had first been betrothed (Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 2nd ed. [1955], pp. 66-67, 181, 214, 253). Maria returned to Constantinople in 1282 and lived until 1308 (*ibid.*, p. 539). On her importance among the Mongols, cf. also James A. Montgomery, trans., *The History of Yaballaha III . . .*, New York, 1927, introd., p. 7, and Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, trans., *The Monks of Küblai Khân, Emperor of China . . .*, London, 1928, introd., pp. 107-8.

Besides his entente with the Mongols, Michael VIII maintained a well-known alliance with the Mamluk "soldan" of Egypt (cf. Marius Canard, "Un Traité entre Byzance et l'Égypte au XIII^e siècle et les relations diplomatiques de Michel VIII Paléologue avec les sultans mamlûks Baibars et Qalâ'ûn," *Mélanges Gaudefroy-Demombynes*, Cairo,

nothing but death would relax Charles of Anjou's ambition.

Shortly after the elevation of John XI Beccus to the patriarchal throne in Constantinople (on 26 May, 1275), Michael VIII sent an embassy to Pope Gregory X to inform him of the official declaration in the Byzantine empire of the union of the Churches declared at Lyon.⁶⁹ This embassy was headed by the youthful George Metochites, recently elected archdeacon of Hagia Sophia. Metochites was accompanied by the finance minister Theodore, who is said to have known Latin. The emperor also wished to learn in full detail whether the pope was enjoying much success in organizing the crusade. If so, Michael could not afford to stand aside: any crusade he did not join would probably end up by being directed against him. Union or no union, then, he had every reason to fear the appearance of a crusading army in the Levant. Michael also wanted the pope to excommunicate his Greek enemy, the restless John Ducas of Neopatra, and to dissolve an alliance which John had made with the Latin princes in Greece.⁷⁰ Gregory X received George Metochites and Theodore in the south of France as he journeyed down the Rhone from Lyon, on his way back to Rome. Gregory was at Beaucaire, just north of Arles, from 14 May

to 4 September (1275),⁷¹ and it was apparently at Beaucaire that Gregory granted Metochites an audience, and then sent him on to Rome to await his arrival there. But on 10 January, 1276, Gregory died at Arezzo, and the Greek envoys found their sojourn in Italy much prolonged. They had no difficulty in discovering that Charles of Anjou was continuing his ceaseless pressures at the Curia Romana to obtain papal permission for an expedition against Constantinople, but such permission was always firmly refused lest an attack by Christians upon Christians should provoke the wrath of God.⁷²

Metochites had made some startling proposals to Gregory X. The Emperor Michael was said to be willing to allow the Latin crusaders free passage through his territories if they chose the land route, which the pope's advisers probably preferred. The crusaders could then traverse Asia Minor on their way to Syria and Palestine. The pope was at least prepared to consider the initial diversion of the crusade from Palestine to Asia Minor (so at any rate we are informed), in which connection he might also help Michael to push back or subdue the recalcitrant Turks and re-establish Byzantine authority in territory which had once belonged to the empire. Thereafter Michael would assist the papacy in a true crusade to win the Holy Land.

This was all a reversion to ideas which had attended the First Crusade, and was it likely of success after almost two centuries of Graeco-Latin hostility? What would be the attitude of the il-khan of Persia, who claimed suzerainty over the Turkish emirs of Anatolia?

1935–45, pp. 219–22, and Canard, "Le Traité de 1281 entre Michel Paléologue et le sultan Qalā'ūn . . .," *Byzantion*, X [1935], 669–80. Of course the union of Lyon should have required Michael eventually to join a crusade against the Mamluks. Cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 275–76.

⁶⁹ Pachymeres, V, 26 (Bonn, I, 409).

⁷⁰ The reference to John Ducas of Neopatra is unmistakable in Michael VIII's memorandum of July or August, 1274, to Pope Gregory (Delisle, ". . . Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," *Notices et extraits des MSS.*, XXVII-2 [1879], 163): "Item quod non recipiat sanctissimus dominus noster papa hominem qui fuerit infidelis imperio Grecorum et habeat terras et castra, et quod non permittat dominus papa aliquem Latinorum principum suscipere eum." On Michael VIII's request to the Holy See for the excommunication of John Ducas of Neopatra, cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, p. 274.

The pro-unionist, "Latinizing" (*latinophrôn*) George Metochites was the father of the now well-known Theodore (d. 1332), one of the chief luminaries of the early Palaeologian "renaissance," who became prime minister in Byzantium in 1305, on whom see Ihor Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, Brussels: Éditions de Byzantion, 1962, and especially his article on "Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time," in P. A. Underwood, ed., *The Kariye Djami*, IV: *Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami and Its Intellectual Background* (Bollingen Series, LXX), Princeton, N.J., 1975, pp. 19–91.

⁷¹ Cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 180 ff.

⁷² Cf. Pachymeres, V, 26 (Bonn, I, 409–10). Gregory X had left Lyon toward the end of April, 1275. On his itinerary and the business which he conducted along the way, see M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 179–99, 270, and cf. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire* (1905), nos. 1936 ff., pp. 469 ff. In a letter of 23 May, 1276, Gregory's successor Innocent V wrote Michael VIII Palaeologus that before his death Gregory had accorded the Greek envoys a cordial reception (Martène and Durand, *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, VII [1733], *Acta varia . . . conc. Lugdunen.*, no. 28, col. 245A): "Sane dictus praedecessor nuncios ipsos solita benignitate audivit. . . ." On the fact that Gregory received Metochites at Beaucaire, note Laurent, *op. cit.*, pp. 270–71, and R. J. Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines: Georges Métochite à Beaucaire (automne 1275) . . .," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 177–78, who also shows that in Dölger's *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 2022, p. 67, should be deleted, and the historical data given in this entry should be put under no. 2015, p. 65.

What of Michael's entente with the soldan of Egypt, against whom of course the crusade was really being directed? What of Charles of Anjou's ambition? Would Gregory's own proposed participation in the crusade suffice to hold this new Bohemond in check? What would be the attitude of the Greeks themselves to the plan? Metochites suggested that the pope and the emperor discuss such problems in a personal meeting to take place just after Easter, 1276, at either Brindisi or Avlona, provided circumstances should make such a meeting practicable. Michael could well insist that his surrender of Byzantine religious independence should be repaid by the territorial increase of his empire. Charles of Anjou and the Venetians might entertain a different opinion, but western Christians could have little objection to the Byzantine re-occupation of the Anatolian lands once ruled by Justinian, Heraclius, and Alexius I.⁷³

⁷³ On the proposals made by Metochites in the Emperor Michael's name, see Vitalien Laurent, "Grégoire X (1271-1276) et le projet d'une ligue antiturque," *Échos d'Orient*, XXXVII (Bucharest, 1938), 257-73, and on Metochites' account of his embassy, see below, Chapter 7, note 3. It is not clear, however, that Metochites later offered Innocent V free passage through Byzantine territories for the crusaders in order that the land route through Asia Minor might be followed to Jerusalem (see M. H. Laurent, "Georges le Métochite, ambassadeur de Michel VIII Paléologue

It is not easy to take all this seriously (Pachymeres and Gregoras know nothing of it), and unless Metochites was grossly misrepresenting the facts, one wonders what the Emperor Michael's purpose was. Was he ready to take the extraordinary risk of allowing Latin armies to march through Greek lands in order to secure parts of Asia Minor as Alexius I had done at the time of the First Crusade? Was he merely giving the Latins another cause for dissension among themselves, since his proposals would presumably evoke both objection and support? Was he reminding Gregory X that if the Greeks, having accepted ecclesiastical union, were also going to participate in the crusade, the Curia Romana would have to find them some substantial compensation? The restoration of wide areas in Asia Minor would be satisfactory; otherwise the Curia could make counterproposals which Michael would be happy to consider. Or was Metochites merely giving free play to his imagination when, thirty years after the event, he finally wrote up the account of his embassy?

auprès du B. Innocent V," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, III [Città del Vaticano, 1946], 141 ff., and *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 269-74). Innocent does not mention the land route in his letter to Michael of 23 May, 1276 (inc. *Dudum ad sedem*), on which see below. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that Innocent knew nothing of the Byzantine proposal.

7. THE HOLY SEE, GREEK OPPOSITION, AND THE FAILURE OF CHURCH UNION (1276–1282)

PIERRE DE TARENTEISE, the first Dominican pope, succeeded Gregory X on 21 January, 1276. The conclave was held at Arezzo in accordance with Gregory's electoral decree *Ubi periculum* (of 7 July, 1274). Pierre took the name Innocent V. Sometime after settling into the Lateran palace in Rome, Innocent resumed the discussions with the Byzantine envoys George Metochites and Theodore, who were of course on a fact-finding mission. They could see for themselves the efforts being made at the Curia Romana by the Angevin party to secure Innocent's permission for Charles of Anjou to launch an expedition against Byzantium. Innocent was, to be sure, a Frenchman,¹ but little more disposed to assist Charles of Anjou than Gregory had been. Nevertheless, the Byzantine envoys were alert to the possibilities of danger.

During the last third of the thirteenth century the Sacred College and electoral conclaves were disturbed by the rivalry of the

Angevin and Roman parties, which had been formed during the pontificates of Urban IV and Clement IV. Although the balance of their contending forces had produced the excellent choice of Gregory X, in years to come it would also mean the aberrant elevation of Celestine V. When the Angevin party made Martin IV pope (in 1281), he surrendered both the Petrine patrimony and the Roman Senate to Charles of Anjou. When the Roman party elected Nicholas III Orsini (in 1277) and Boniface VIII Caetani (in 1294), French objectives were obviously going to be sacrificed to the dynastic interests of the popes' families, and greater efforts would be made to strengthen the political and military position of the papal states than to pull French chestnuts out of the Italian fire. Of course Pierre de Tarentaise—Pope Innocent V—was a Frenchman or rather a Burgundian. His natural affiliations were with the Franco-Angevin party. He did make major concessions to Charles of Anjou, but they did not include authorization of an Angevin "crusade" against Byzantium. On the very day Innocent V took possession of the Lateran palace and basilica (25 February, 1276), he called upon the Christian princes to wrest the holy places in Palestine from the hands of the infidels.²

Answering the inquiries of the Emperor Michael VIII's embassy by letters dated at the Lateran on 23 May (1276), Innocent V acknowledged the presence at the Curia Romana of the Byzantine envoys George Metochites, archdeacon of Constantinople, and Theodore, minister of finance (*magnus tuae curiae dispensator*), seeking information concerning papal plans for the crusade. The pope informed the emperor that Rudolph of Hapsburg, Philip III of France, Alfonso III of Portugal, Charles of Anjou's son, and many nobles and magnates had taken the cross, but that the date of the expedition had not yet been determined.³ In

¹ Pope Innocent V was born about 1224 in the little village of Tarentaise, which still exists, in the diocese of Lyon. He was prominent as a theologian at the University of Paris (1259–1264, 1267–1269), served twice as Dominican provincial of France (1264–1267, 1269–1272), was appointed archbishop of Lyon in June, 1272, and was finally created cardinal bishop of Ostia by Gregory X in late May, 1273 (M. H. Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V . . .* [1947, repr. 1961], chaps. 1–v, and on Innocent's election as pope on 21 January, 1276, see, *ibid.*, pp. 200 ff.). In the thirteenth century appointment to the suburbicarian see of Ostia did not carry with it *eo ipso* the deanship of the Sacred College (cf., *op. cit.*, p. 134, note 3). The archival registers of Innocent V's brief reign are unfortunately no longer extant, having been lost apparently in the fourteenth century (*op. cit.*, p. 16), but a number of his letters survive in the collection compiled by the notary Bérard of Naples, who was employed in the papal chancery in the later thirteenth century (Léopold Delisle, ". . . Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXVII, pt. 2 [Paris, 1879], 87 ff., and see also M. H. Laurent, "Catalogue des actes imprimés concernant Innocent V," Appendix 5 in *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 444–509, with *regestes* of 272 documents, of which at least ten are of erroneous attribution). On the importance of Bérard of Naples' letter book for eastern affairs, see Friedrich Bock, "Annotationes zu der Sammlung Berards von Neapel, Reg. Vat. 29A," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXII (1956), 214–23, and on the Angevin registers (destroyed in 1943) for the reign of Charles of Anjou, note Nicola Nicolini, "Datazioni angioine," *Accademia Pontaniana*, new ser., VIII, 1–12 (I cite an undated offprint).

² Cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V . . .*, pp. 228 ff. After the papacy of Gregory X, Charles of Anjou was naturally delighted with the election of Pierre de Tarentaise (Riccardo Filangieri, ed., *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, XIII [Naples, 1959], pp. 209–10).

³ Martène and Durand, *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, VII (Paris, 1733), *Acta varia . . . conc. Lugdunen.*,

a second letter he emphasized the joy which the late Pope Gregory had taken in the union of Lyon, in which he himself as a cardinal had shared. He said that he was sending a papal embassy to Constantinople. It would consist of four Franciscans, headed by Jerome of Ascoli, who was no stranger to the Byzantine court. He exhorted Michael to ratify the act and articles of union.⁴

In the third letter of 23 May (1276) addressed to Michael VIII, Pope Innocent repeated his request for imperial confirmation of the unionist acts of Lyon, and made most pointed reference to the designs which Philip of Courtenay and Charles of Anjou had upon Byzantium. Innocent desired peace as well as union, and reminded Michael that Byzantium could escape the hostile intentions of the houses of Anjou and Courtenay only by maintaining religious concord under the protection of the

Apostolic See. In this connection he was sending Jerome of Ascoli and his fellow Franciscans on an embassy to the Bosphorus.⁵ On the same date Innocent wrote John Beccus, the new patriarch of Constantinople, and the high Byzantine clergy, reminding them of the letter which they had sent in 1274 to Gregory X in attestation of their acceptance of the Latin faith. He urged them to spare no effort to advance and confirm the *unionis negotium* and thus avoid the old evil of schism, and stated that he was sending the Franciscan embassy to the Greek capital to receive their profession of faith and their recognition of the primacy of the Roman Church.⁶

As these letters were being prepared for their Greek recipients, instructions were also drafted for Jerome of Ascoli and his companions, who were to bear the pope's affectionate greeting and special benediction to the Emperor Michael and his son Andronicus, after which they should present the letters the pope had addressed to the emperor, the patriarch, and the Greek clergy. The envoys must make clear to the Greeks the importance which the papacy attached to the "business of union." The emperor must confirm by an oath (*proprio praestando corporaliter juramento*) the profession of faith and recognition of the Roman primacy to which the logothete George Acropolites had sworn two years before, because although Acropolites had done so on the emperor's behalf, he had apparently been unable to present the Curia Romana with an adequate warrant of his authority to perform so solemn a function.

Andronicus was to take the same oath as his father, and so were the Greek clergy. The imperial declarations were to be written on parchment, signed by Michael and his son with their accustomed subscriptions, and sealed with a golden bull. Copies were to be made on

no. 28, cols. 244–46, inc. *Dudum ad sedem*; cf. M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, Appendix 5, no. 146, p. 478, with refs., and Delisle, "Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," *Notices et extraits*, XXVII-2, pp. 131–32, 136–37.

Some thirty years later George Metochites gave an account of his embassy to the Curia Romana in 1275–1276 (it occurs in a treatise on the procession of the Holy Spirit), on which see Vitalien Laurent, "Le Rapport de Georges le Métochite, apocrisiaire de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès du pape Grégoire X . . .," in the *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXIII (1946), 233–47, who gives the relevant portion of Metochites' Greek text from the early fourteenth-century Cod. Vat. gr. 1716, fols. 72r–74v (*op. cit.*, pp. 240–47), which was independently edited from the same MS. by Ciro Giannelli in Appendix 4 of M. H. Laurent's *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 418 ff., 435–43. In Innocent's letter to Michael VIII there is no clear mention of the crusaders' traversing Byzantine territories and using the Anatolian route into the Holy Land, as Metochites had suggested to Gregory X. Innocent must have known of the proposal. Was the offer not repeated to him or did he choose not to consider it in his reply to Michael?

⁴ Martène and Durand, *Amplissima collectio*, VII, no. 30, cols. 248–49, and M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append., no. 147, pp. 478–79: ". . . quo cum fratribus nostris pensato prudentius, ea quae per te acta sunt, soliditate roboris plenioris comperimus indigere" (Martène, col. 249C). On 23 May (1276) Innocent also wrote Andronicus [II], son of Michael VIII, recalling the commitment which Andronicus had made two years before to Gregory X "ad professionem catholicae fidei et recognitionem primatus ecclesiae Romanae matris fidelium et magistrarum," and engaging him to renew his allegiance to the Roman Church as his father was also being required to do (Martène, VII, no. 32, cols. 251–52, and Laurent, *op. cit.*, append., no. 149, p. 479). On the same date the pope granted Jerome of Ascoli and the Franciscan mission the powers of absolution, excommunication and the interdict, and other faculties to help them effect the indisputable union of the Churches while they were in Constantinople (Martène, VII, no. 33, cols. 252–53, and Laurent, *op. cit.*, append., no. 151, pp. 479–80).

⁵ Martène and Durand, *Ampl. coll.*, VII, no. 29, cols. 246–48, and M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append., no. 150, p. 479: ". . . sicut per alias tibi notificavimus litteras, plenioris soliditatis robore indigere . . ." (Martène, col. 247C). Innocent V's allusion to the intentions of Philip of Courtenay and Charles of Anjou to retake Constantinople seems a trifle harsh, considering the fact that church union and the crusade were to be the major purposes of the Franciscan mission (cf. Martène, col. 247D).

⁶ Martène and Durand, VII, no. 31, cols. 249–51, and M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append., no. 148, p. 479. Charles of Anjou issued a safe conduct for Jerome of Ascoli on 28 May, 1276 (Camillo Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 3rd ser., XXV [1877], 38).

paper. The Greek clergy must neither preach in public nor teach in private anything contrary to the profession of faith which the pope now required of them. In fact the Greek clergy were to expound the *fidei veritas* to their people, and sing the symbol with the insertion of the *filioque* clause. Public instruments were to be drawn up of the Greek prelates' professions of faith and recognition of the Roman primacy, of which various copies were to be prepared and duly sealed, so that they might be employed as needed, and some might be preserved in the papal archives.⁷

Reconsideration of the emperor's problems, however, and of the difficulties which he was imposing upon his envoys, may have led the pope to give Jerome of Ascoli another set of instructions on 26 May (1276): if the emperor would not take in public the oath demanded of him, he must at least do so in the presence of several responsible persons (*praesentibus pluribus viris probis*), including prelates and nobles. If Michael would not abjure schism by a personal oath, he must at least ratify every detail of the oath which Acropolites took in his name at the Council of Lyon. If the declarations of faith by Michael and Andronicus could not be secured in multiple copies, "at least one or two must be had." The oath of the Greek prelates must at least contain an implicit submission to the Apostolic See, and if a large number of public instruments attesting their professions of faith and recognition of papal primacy could not be obtained, at least several copies must be had.⁸

It was of course customary to provide a departing embassy with secondary or secret instructions indicating the extent to which a pope or prince was willing to see his initial demands compromised. The concessions of 26 May seem to be large enough to suggest some difference of opinion at the Curia, for if the demands contained in Jerome of Ascoli's first set of instructions were refused at Constantinople,

it would be well at least to be sure that nothing was lost which Gregory X had gained at Lyon.

Innocent V's letters of 23 May and the concessions contained in the secret instructions of the twenty-sixth are valuable as illustrating the papal and curial attitude toward the Byzantine court and church. But neither the first nor the second set of Innocent's instructions could be put into effect, because as Jerome and the Franciscan mission were beginning their long journey to Constantinople, the news reached them at Ancona of the pope's death (on 22 June, 1276). Leaving Metochites and Theodore, Jerome and the Franciscans returned to Rome.⁹ Presumably they believed that Innocent's death had nullified the validity of their commission, and the next pope might have other ideas for an embassy to the Byzantine capital.

Papal deaths and excited conclaves occurred frequently during the years 1276 and 1277. Within less than two years five popes occupied S. Peter's throne in succession—Gregory X, Innocent V, Hadrian V, John XXI, and Nicholas III. More than one embassy passed between Italy and Constantinople during this period.¹⁰ George Metochites was himself back in Rome in 1277 as a member of a Byzantine diplomatic mission. The regnal changes in Rome were baffling to the Byzantines and frustrating for the Angevins, but at least three of these five popes wished to put into effect the resolutions of the Second Council of Lyon with respect to the crusade and the union of the Churches. However, John XXI was much under the influence of Cardinal Giovanni Gaetano Orsini, who succeeded him as Nicholas III, and the latter found too much to do (as we shall note) in trying to rebuild the power of the papacy and to effect the aggrandizement of his own family to make the crusade one of the prime objectives of his reign.

Hadrian V died in August, 1276, before he

⁷ Martène and Durand, VII, no. 34, cols. 253–56, and cf. no. 34 bis, col. 257; M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append., no. 153, p. 480, and cf. no. 156, p. 481. On the apparent inadequacy of Acropolites' mandate from Michael VIII to take the oath he did at Lyon (on 6 July, 1274), see, above, Chapter 6, note 49.

⁸ Martène and Durand, VII, no. 35, cols. 257–58, and M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, append., no. 158, pp. 481–82. Since our sole source for Innocent V's letters is the collection of the apostolic notary Bérard of Naples, we must depend entirely upon Bérard's accuracy and good faith.

⁹ Cf. V. Laurent, "Le Rapport de Georges le Métochite . . .," *Revue historique du sud-est européen*, XXIII (1946), 238, and see in general Émile A. van Moë, "L'Envoi de nonces à Constantinople par les papes Innocent V et Jean XXI (1276)," in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XLVII (Paris, 1930), 39–62, esp. pp. 45 ff., and of course M. H. Laurent, *Le B. Innocent V*, pp. 279–85.

¹⁰ Cf. Charles of Anjou's safe-conduct dated 28 November, 1276, to a Byzantine embassy on the point of returning to Constantinople, *ambassadors Palaiologi redeunt ad ipsum* (Filangieri, *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, XV [Naples, 1961], no. 133, p. 31).

could even be crowned,¹¹ and in a rather tumultuous conclave held at Viterbo the cardinals elected Pietro di Giuliano "Hispanus," who was crowned on 20 September as Pope John XXI. Physician, logician, theologian, John was quite as devoted to the crusading ideal as his predecessors.¹² At his accession, however, he found himself faced with a serious obstacle. King Philip III of France, on whom the success of the projected crusade would largely depend, had become involved in a dynastic quarrel with Alfonso X of Castile. Pope John sent Jerome of Ascoli, together with the Dominican general Jean de Verceil, to the two sovereigns in an effort to resolve their differences lest their recourse to arms should make the crusade impossible. But Jerome, who was well known in Constantinople from his previous mission (and was a close acquaintance of George Metochites), thus became unavailable for the Greek mission to which Innocent V had appointed him.¹³

John XXI now chose an entirely new mission consisting of the bishops of Ferentino and Turin and two Dominicans, of whom one was prior of the convent of Viterbo and the other was

lector of that at Lucca. In November, 1276, John gave them new letters and instructions which were apparently modeled upon Innocent V's letters of 23 May. The Dominican mission must have left Viterbo early in December, 1276.¹⁴ The date of its arrival in Constantinople is unknown, but the register of Nicholas III's curial letters contains all the Greek responses to John XXI's demands. In April, 1277, Michael VIII sent his profession of Catholic faith, requested the preservation of the ancient Byzantine rites, and repeated the oath which George Acropolites had taken on his behalf at Lyon. Similar professions of faith were also forthcoming from Michael's son Andronicus [II], the Patriarch John Beccus, and the Holy Synod in Constantinople.¹⁵

At this point perhaps some further word should be said concerning affairs in the Morea, which were always important to Charles of Anjou. For the restored Palaeologian empire, the cession of Mistra, Grand Magne (or Maina), Geraki, and Monemvasia in 1262 was pregnant with consequences quite beyond the vision to foresee of those who participated in their surrender. The Greek *Chronicle of the Morea* (vv. 4534–35) identifies a Cantacuzenus as the first Byzantine captain (κεφαλῇ) of the ceded territory: he began by establishing himself in Monemvasia, with easy access to reinforcements by sea. From this quadrilateral of Greek fortresses the influence of the Palaeologi ex-

¹¹ There was a close connection between Charles and the family of Pope Hadrian V, "quem multum dileximus" (Filangieri, *Registri*, XVI [1962], no. 22, p. 9, and see also Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 3rd ser., XXV [1877], 108, entry under date of 27 October, 1276), who obviously did not live long enough to render any assistance to Charles, who had helped secure his election on 11 July (1276), on which see especially Richard Sternfeld, *Der Kardinal Johann Gaëtan Orsini (Papst Nikolaus III.), 1244–1277*, Berlin, 1905, repr. Vaduz, 1965, pp. 252–63. During his thirty-nine-day reign Hadrian contributed 12,000 pounds *tournois* to the support of Christians in the Holy Land (Adolf Gottlob, *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-Steuern des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Heiligenstadt [Eichsfeld], 1892, p. 113). See in general the substantial monograph of Natalie Schöpp, *Papst Hadrian V (Kardinal Ottobuono Fieschi)*, Heidelberg, 1916 (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte, Heft 49).

¹² John XXI seems to have been especially vigilant in his efforts to collect and administer the crusading tithe (cf. Jean Guiraud and Léon Cadier, eds., *Les Registres de Grégoire X (1272–1276) et de Jean XXI (1276–1277)*, Paris, 1892–1960; Cadier, *Le Registre de Jean XXI*, nos. 4, 11, 13, 68, 89, 91, 93–99, 102–6, 110, 116, 138, 143–44). Cf. Martin of Toppau, *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, ad ann. 1276, in *MGH, SS.*, XXII (1872), 443. In a letter to the episcopacy of the province of Rheims dated 7 October, 1276, John alludes to the disorder preceding his election *per importunitatem Viterbiensium civium* (Cadier, *Registre de Jean XXI*, no. 1, pp. 1–2, and cf. Sternfeld, *Kardinal Johann Gaëtan Orsini*, pp. 267–68).

¹³ E. A. van Moë, "L'Envoi de nonces à Constantinople . . .," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XLVII (1930), 48–49.

¹⁴ Charles of Anjou issued a safe-conduct for the departure of the mission on 8 December (Filangieri, *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, XV [1961], no. 136, pp. 31–32).

¹⁵ Jules Gay and Suzanne Vitte, eds., *Les Registres de Nicolas III (1277–1280)*, 5 fascs., 1898–1938, nos. 228–30, pp. 81–87; note also, *ibid.*, nos. 220–21, 367 ff.; J. D. Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV (1780, repr. 1903), cols. 183–90; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1277, nos. 21–39, vol. XXII (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), pp. 392–99; Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, V (3rd ed., Quaracchi, 1931), 10–17; and see van Moë, "L'Envoi de nonces à Constantinople . . .," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XLVII (1930), 49–56, and cf. the documents published by the latter, *ibid.*, pp. 56–62; V. Grumel, "Le II^e Concile de Lyon et la réunion de l'église grecque," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (Paris, 1926), cols. 1395–96. Chas. J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, trans. H. Leclercq, VI-1 (Paris, 1914), 210–11, is of course inaccurate. Angelo Mercati, "Note archivistiche . . . su un documento . . . di Giovanni Bekkos, patriarcha di Costantinopoli," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXI (1955), Miscellanea Georg Hofmann, S. J., pp. 256–64, has published a Latin version of Beccus's synodal letter of 16 July, 1277, bearing the autograph signature of "John, by the grace of God patriarch of Constantinople, the New Rome," excommunicating schismatics and disrupters of the union of the Churches.

tended throughout the southeastern Morea. Decades later, in 1349, the Greek "despotate" of Mistra was set up to rule over these lands. The first despot was Manuel Cantacuzenus, son of the Emperor John VI. Under the Cantacuzeni and the Palaeologi, who succeeded them as despots, the crowded fortress city of Mistra became, after Constantinople, the chief center of Greek political strength and culture. Mistra survives to this day as a Byzantine "ghost town," and the informed traveler who walks around its seven fine churches, with exteriors now intact or restored, through the extensive remains of the Palaeologian palace, and up to the great Frankish castle on the crown of the hill, cannot help but people its steep, narrow, and winding ways with the lordly figures of its heroic, colorful, and romantic past.

The great period in the history of the principality of Achaea was that during which the three Villehardouin princes ruled, Geoffrey I, Geoffrey II, and William, although William's last years were marked by serious decline, owing to the re-establishment of Greek authority and spirit in the Morea. Despite the growing power of the Byzantine government, which had taken over the Latin baronies of Passavá and Kalavryta, William of Villehardouin had maintained his principality almost to the extent that he had inherited it from his elder brother. In the mountains of Messenia and in the plain between Nikli (near ancient Tegea) and Veligosti (near Megalopolis), along the valley of the river Alpheus, into Elis, and beyond Mount Erymanthus in Achaea, as well as in Corinthia and in the Argolid, the Greek natives and Latin knights and barons owned the sway of the prince of Achaea. It was a goodly realm.

Prince William's son-in-law and heir, Philip of Anjou, died between January and March, 1277. It was a severe blow to William, who had expected his daughter Isabelle to share the Moreote succession with her husband Philip. The latter's death had effected the disherison of William's own daughter Isabelle, although a generous chance was to bring her again the princely title of Achaea. When William died himself, on 1 May, 1278, although he could make some provision for his wife, Anna of Epirus, and for his daughters, the Villehardouin principality of Achaea became the direct possession of the Angevins. Charles of Anjou now added to his many other titles (king of Jerusalem and Sicily, duke of Apulia, prince of Capua, etc.) that of prince of Achaea,

retaining the authority it signified until his death (in January, 1285). For Charles, Achaea like Albania was of course an important stepping-stone on the way to Constantinople. As far as we know, however, Charles of Anjou never went into the Morea, but ruled the principality by a bailie and vicar-general, the first incumbent of which office, Galeran d'Ivry, grand seneschal of the kingdom of Sicily, provoked by his arrogant airs and arbitrary decisions the keen resentment of the independent barons of the Morea. They appealed to Charles, who was obliged to caution d'Ivry and confirm the barons' rights and the customs of the principality on 12 April, 1280.¹⁶ The good old days of a prince always resident in the Morea, peer of his vassals, who met under him in the high court of Achaea to exercise justice according to the laws and usages of the principality, were gone. The ruler now became an

¹⁶ Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., III (1879), 12-13. Charles of Anjou also directed Galeran d'Ivry to take into the royal service the Turks and Cumans whom the late Prince William had formerly employed (*ibid.*, p. 13), on which see the document published by Evelyn M. Jamison, "Documents from the Angevin Registers of Naples: Charles I," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XVII (new ser., IV, 1949), no. 181, p. 136. D'Ivry was appointed vicar-general of the principality of Achaea on 26 August, 1278 (Minieri-Riccio, *op. cit.*, 4th ser., I [1878], 433), and was replaced by Philip of Lagonesse on 2 August, 1280 (*ibid.*, III [1879], 164). When Lagonesse was preparing to depart for the Morea with a half-dozen transports loaded with troops and provisions, Charles of Anjou ordered that two jurists, Taddeo di Firenze and Pisano d'Amalfi, go with him "to compose the differences between him and the widow of Prince William of Achaea" (*ibid.*, p. 165, and cf. Jamison, *op. cit.*, nos. 206-7, pp. 154-55). They must have required a good deal of composing. On the final arrangements made for Anna, called Agnes by the Latins, widow of Prince William, cf. Minieri-Riccio, *ibid.*, 4th ser., IV (1879), 176-77, 351, and *ibid.*, VII (1881), 10. In 1280 she married Nicholas II of S. Omer, and according to the genealogical table in Ch. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 469, she died about 1284.

Soon after William of Villehardouin's death Charles of Anjou took over the mint at Glarentza, and had coins issued exactly like those of William except with the substitution of his own name as prince (K[arolus] R[ex] PRINC[eps] ACH[aye]): "Quam quidem monetam laborari et cudi facias in ipsa sicla [mint] studiose et legaliter per magistros et alias personas proinde necessarias per quas laborari et fieri consuevit tempore condam bone me[m]orie Guillelmi illustris principis Achaye carissimi affinis nostri . . . , que sit illius tenoris valoris modi et forme cuius erat eodem tem[pore] ipsius principis mutato tantum ex una parte ipsius monete nomine eiusdem principis et posito felici nomine nostro" (G. M. Monti, "La Zecca di Clarenza sotto Carlo I," in *Nuovi Studi angioini*, Trani, 1937, pp. 601-2).

absentee lord. His military forces were chiefly mercenaries, who sometimes pillaged the country. The Morea became the victim of the bureaucratic whims of officials in the highly centralized kingdom of Sicily, which paid it sometimes too much attention and sometimes too little.

Charles of Anjou never rested. Both his activities and his dreams were expensive. When he expressed his intention of going on the crusade, Gregory X granted him for six years the Sicilian tithe as well as those of the counties of Provence and Forcalquier. If Charles did not actually embark on the expedition, the tithes in question would revert to his son, the prince of Salerno, who was supposed to make the eastward passage as a crusader.¹⁷ Other sovereigns, and those of larger stature than Charles and his son, had also taken the cross, for the Council of Lyon seemed a great success to immediate contemporaries. The new emperor in Germany, the kings of France, England, and Aragon, the dukes of Burgundy and Brabant, and various other princelings and high prelates declared themselves crusaders. But Rudolph of Hapsburg still had to deal with the imperial claims of Alfonso of Castile-León and meet the armed attacks of Ottokar of Bohemia. Edward I of England, who knew the Holy Land at first hand, had no desire to return to the East on some ill-prepared crusade and leave his major problems unsolved at home. Philip III of France, despite declarations and gestures to the contrary, had no intention of emulating his father's career as a crusader. Charles of Anjou, to return to him, was interested in the crusade largely as a device to acquire Constantinople. The success of Gregory X at Lyon was only an illusion.

Cardinal Giovanni Gaetano Orsini succeeded John XXI on 25 November, 1277, following a *vacatio sedis* of six months. The scholarly John had died the preceding May when the ceiling of his study collapsed on him at Viterbo.¹⁸ Cardinal Orsini took the name Nicholas III. His election was a victory of the Roman over

the Angevin party in the Curia.¹⁹ It was probably in late January, 1278, that Nicholas sent two couriers named Marco and Marchetto to Constantinople to bear the news of his accession to the Emperor Michael VIII and the Patriarch John Beccus. As Marco and Marchetto prepared to return to Rome in the late spring or early summer of 1278, the emperor and patriarch entrusted to them letters of congratulation to Nicholas upon the joyous tidings.²⁰ The emperor also gave them an oral message for the new pope, and one Ogerius (Ogier), an imperial protonotary and chief Latin interpreter in Michael VIII's chancery, prepared written instructions for them. Actually these "instructions" are a detailed account of the opposition which Michael had encountered in seeking to bind the Constantinopolitan church to that of Rome. Ogerius's memorial was certainly intended less for study by Marco and Marchetto than for consideration by papal advisers in the Curia Romana.²¹ Events would soon show, however, that neither Ogerius's

¹⁹ Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1277, no. 53, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 405–6. On the interregnum of 1277 and the factional rivalry preceding Nicholas III's election, see Sternfeld, *Kardinal Johann Gaëtan Orsini*, pp. 288–300. Despite the check to his ambition which Charles of Anjou received in the election of Nicholas, the Angevins were at the height of their power in 1277.

²⁰ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1277, nos. 60–61, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 410–11; Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, nos. 382–83, pp. 132–34; Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 (1932), no. 2038, pp. 71–72; and see esp. R. J. Loenertz, "Mémoire d'Ogier, protonotaire, pour Marco et Marchetto nonces de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès du Pape Nicolas III," in *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, pp. 537 ff. (Storia e letteratura, Raccolta di studi e testi, no. 118). This volume is a reprint of various articles by Loenertz, the one in question having been first published in *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXXI (1965), 374–408.

²¹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1278, nos. 13–14, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 417–19; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, V (1931), 72–76; Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, pp. 134–37; and cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines: Les Instructions d'Ogier . . .," *Revue des études byzantines*, XX (1962), 178–80, who shows that Ogerius's letter was delivered to the Curia in September, 1278, at the very latest, and not after the death of Pope Nicholas III on 22 August, 1280, as maintained by Grumel, "Le II^e Concile de Lyon," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (1926), col. 1402, and cf. his article on "Les Ambassades pontificales à Byzance après le II^e concile de Lyon (1274–1280)," *Échos d'Orient*, XXIII (1924), 442 ff. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 539–41, makes the point that while Nicholas III sent Marco and Marchetto to Constantinople as mere couriers (*latores litterarum*), Michael VIII sent them back to Rome as his accredited envoys (*nuntii*) by entrusting them with a secret mission to the pope.

¹⁷ J. B. Martin, *Conciles et bullaire du diocèse de Lyon*, Lyon, 1905, no. 1945, p. 471, doc. dated at Lausanne on 13 October, 1275. The crusading tithe, voted at Lyon, was also granted to Alfonso of Castile-León and to Edward I of England (*ibid.*, nos. 1946–47).

¹⁸ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1277, no. 19, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 390–91, from Ptolemy of Lucca, and cf. Salimbene [degli Adami], *Cronica*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH*, SS., XXXII (1905–13, repr. 1963), 304, 497, 498.

text nor the verbal message which Marco and Marchetto brought the pope made an impression sufficient to cause the Curia to moderate a certain intransigence which was beginning to manifest itself in Rome when it came to dealing with the so-called eastern question.

The imperial professions of faith for which John XXI had asked, were presented to Nicholas III. Of the document bearing Michael's subscription in cinnabar ink, four contemporary Latin originals are still preserved in the Vatican Archives; of the similar text which Andronicus signed, the Greek version as well as two Latin originals are extant. Two of the texts still have the gold seals which made them "chrysobulls."²² Obviously the papal request for multiple copies of these texts was most courteously acceded to in Constantinople.

The Greek enemies of Michael VIII were not likely to accept the union with the Latins which he had forced upon the Byzantine Church. The Despot Nicephorus Ducas of Epirus and his bastard brother John Ducas of Neopatras, who bore the title of sebastocrator in Thessaly, relying (oddly enough) upon the support of the Latins in Greece, became ardent defenders of Orthodoxy, for which they (and all recalcitrants like them) were excommunicated by the Patriarch John Beccus on Friday, 16 July, 1277, at a synod held in Hagia Sophia.²³ Neopatras became a gathering

place for both lay and ecclesiastical opponents of church union, and John Ducas had the pope, the emperor, and the patriarch excommunicated at an ecclesiastical council of his own late in the year 1276, but neither side found either spiritual weapons or military encounters entirely decisive as the strife continued. Although Michael VIII thus had his hands full, trying to enforce the union in Byzantine territory, Pope Nicholas III appointed another embassy in October, 1278, to demand in rather uncompromising terms the fulfillment of certain theological and other requirements which the Greeks had eluded or glossed over in making their profession of faith and accepting the doctrine of papal supremacy. Detailed preparations were made for the dispatch to Constantinople of the embassy, which was to consist of Fra Bartolommeo d'Amelia, bishop of Grosseto; Fra Bartolommeo da Siena, Franciscan provincial minister of Syria; and Fra Filippo da Perugia and Fra Angelo d'Orvieto, both lecturers of the Franciscan Order.²⁴ Their mission seemed

²² Gustave Schlumberger, "Bulles d'or byzantines conservées aux Archives Vaticanes," *Revue numismatique*, 3rd ser., XII (Paris, 1894), 194-97, with plate IV, nos. 1-2, from Arch. Segr. Vaticano, A. A., Arm. I-XVIII, nos. 399, 393 (formerly Arm. II, caps. 2, nos. 13, 7). On the contemporary extant copies of the professions of faith made by Michael VIII and Andronicus [II], see especially Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, nos. 2028, 2073, pp. 70, 76-77.

²³ Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 189-90; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1277, nos. 41-42, vol. XXII (1870), p. 400; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, VI-1 (1914), 212; Grumel, "Le II^e Concile de Lyon," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1, cols. 1396 ff. John Ducas was known to the Latins as the "duke of Neopatras," as the protonotary Ogerius observed in his instructions to the papal couriers Marco and Marchetto, ". . . filius naturalis domini Michalicii [the Despot Michael II of Epirus] qui a Latinis dux Patre vocatur" (Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, p. 135a; Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, par. 5, p. 552).

Ogerius deals at length with the hostility which the Despot Nicephorus and his brother Duke John manifested toward Michael VIII and the difficulties which they created for him. Opponents of ecclesiastical union in Constantinople supported their anti-Palaeologian stance, even sending to the Grand Comnenus George of Trebizond (1266-1280) to inform him "that the emperor has become a heretic, is subject to the pope, and has united the Greek and Latin

Churches, and if you will declare yourself emperor, we will join you . . .," and George, "misled by this inane counsel, had himself proclaimed emperor and was crowned, dressed himself in imperial vestments, and appointed officials . . ." (*Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, p. 136a; Loenertz, *op. cit.*, par. 12, p. 554). On Constantinopolitan objections to the ruler of Trebizond's employing the imperial title, cf. Geo. Pachymeres, *De Michael Palaeologo*, VI, 34 (Bonn, I, 519 ff.), and the meandering reflections of A. A. Vasiliev, "The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond," *Speculum*, XI (1936), 30 ff.

The Latins in Thebes and Athens, Negroponte, and the Morea of course encouraged and aided Nicephorus and John Ducas against Michael VIII (*Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, pp. 136b-137a), and on 14 March, 1280, we find envoys of the Despot Nicephorus preparing to leave Brindisi for the Morea, having fulfilled their mission to the Angevin court and now going possibly to consult with the Latin baronage of Achaea (Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., III [1879], 8). By 25 September, 1281, Nicephorus is in alliance with Charles of Anjou, the Latin Emperor Philip, and the Venetians "per combattere il Paleologo" (*ibid.*, IV [1879], 17).

²⁴ Fifteen letters are extant relating to the dispatch of this embassy (Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, nos. 367-81, pp. 123-32, docs. dated 7-18 October, 1278). Cf. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, V (1931), 32 ff. Bartolommeo da Siena is said to have been a member of the Piccolomini family (Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa*, I [Quaracchi, 1906], 300). V. Grumel, "Les Ambassades pontificales à Byzance . . .," *Échos d'Orient*, XXIII (1924), 443, and "En Orient après le II^e concile de Lyon," *ibid.*, XXIV (1925), 321-24, has dated the anti-unionist council of John Ducas in December, 1277. It was presumably held in Neopatras. The chronology of events, however, is not without difficulties (cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 2044, p. 73). The only source for the anti-unionist

likely to have its difficulties, because the attitude of the Curia Romana was clearly hardening toward what some members of the Curia regarded as Greek evasiveness.

At any rate the Greeks had not made their obeisance to Rome quite in the form which the Curia wanted (*iuxta formam ab eadem ecclesia [Romana] traditam*),²⁵ and to prevent misunderstanding Nicholas supplied his envoys with a text of the oath which the Greek prelates were to use in their acceptance of Latin Catholicism.²⁶ The Greeks must employ the *filioque* clause, for unity of faith could not be achieved in diversity.²⁷ But for the rest the Greeks might retain such of their ancient rites as in the judgment of the papacy were not inconsistent with the faith and the canons. Michael was to help negotiate the continuance of peace with Philip of Courtenay and Charles of Anjou, and even be prepared to receive a cardinal legate in Constantinople who would have full authority in religious matters.²⁸ Under the circumstances these and certain other papal demands seem excessive, and Nicholas III was pressing the emperor too far. Church union could be maintained only by a mutual desire to find the means. Latin arrogance and the Greek sense of grievance were grave impediments to union. Undoubtedly the Greeks found satisfaction in their theological

differences with Rome. Opposition to the *filioque* clause and the doctrine of papal primacy was a way of preventing subjection of the Greek to the Latin spirit.

For whatever reasons, the mission which Pope Nicholas III had appointed in October, 1278, did not leave for Constantinople until the following January. Charles of Anjou issued a safe-conduct for its four members on 7 January, 1279.²⁹ As far as the Emperor Michael VIII was concerned, it was a poor time to receive papal envoys. Charles seemed ominously active in Naples. In January, 1279, he ordered an array of all his feudatories in Italy, Sicily, and Provence; summoned coiners and minters from Brindisi to the Castel dell'Uovo in Naples; and started the construction of royal dwellings in the regions of Bari and Otranto. The following month he directed that a second tower be built like the one recently put up in the harbor at Brindisi, so that a chain could be suspended from one to the other and block access to the harbor at night.³⁰ He exchanged embassies with the king of Serbia and received one from the king of Cilician Armenia. In April he ordered the shipment to Brindisi of arms and munitions, which were to be sent over to the Dalmatian coast "to fortify the castles of Butrinto and Suboto,"³¹ which he was acquiring from the Despot Nicephorus Ducas of Epirus. Michael VIII's religious policy had helped make Nicephorus not merely an Angevin ally but a vassal, in which connection Charles had just received a solemn embassy from Epirus. On 8 April he ordered the harbor-masters of Apulia to allow the Greeks, their mission completed, free departure from the kingdom, and on the tenth he ratified the articles of an Angevin-Epirote pact, and authorized his own envoys to Arta "to receive in his name from the said despot the oath of homage and of fealty and also the oath for the observance of

council is Ogerius's "instructions" to Marco and Marchetto, and Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 548-49, has shown reasons for placing this council late in 1276, "January, 1277, at the latest."

²⁵ Cf. Martène and Durand, *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, VII (1733), *Acta varia . . . conc. Lugdunen.*, no. 43, col. 269C; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1278, no. 7, vol. XXII (1870), p. 415a; Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 376, p. 128b.

²⁶ Martène and Durand, VII, col. 270, and Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1278, no. 9, vol. XXII (1870), p. 415b.

²⁷ Martène and Durand, VII, col. 269D; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1278, no. 8, vol. XXII (1870), p. 415a; Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 376, p. 128b: "Item super eo quod dictus imperator in prefatis suis litteris petit ut ecclesia Grecorum dicat sanctum symbolum sicut dicebat hoc ante scisma, et ipsi Greci maneant in ritibus suis. Respondendum est quod unitas fidei non patitur diversitatem in professoribus [Raynaldus: professionibus] suis, sive in professione sive in decantatione vel alia ipsius fidei publicatione . . . , et ideo deliberavit eadem Romana ecclesia et vult ipsum cum adiectione illa *Filioque* tam a Latinis quam a Grecis uniformiter decantari. . . ." The Greeks were not to allege that taking oaths was contrary to their custom.

²⁸ Martène and Durand, VII, cols. 270-72; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1278, nos. 10-11, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 415-16; Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 376, p. 130a: ". . . quod multum esset utilis in partibus illis presentia cardinalis, qui auctoritatem plenam haberet . . ." (Martène, col. 272C).

²⁹ Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 299, "datum Neapoli die VII Ianuarii [1279]." Charles granted the papal mission, the bishop of Grosseto and his three companions, free passage from the kingdom *sine pedagio vel iure aliquo*, and included in the safe conduct "the nuncios or envoys [*apocriarii*] of Palaeologus," who were returning with them to Constantinople. The document is given in Golubovich, *loc. cit.*, and summarized in C. Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., II (1878), 193.

³⁰ Minieri-Riccio, *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., II (1878), 193, 194, 196.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 195, 197, 198.

the pact."³² On 18 May (1279) Charles ordered 1,700 marks of fine bronze sent to Galeran d'Ivry, seneschal of the kingdom of Sicily and since August, 1278, vicar-general of the principality of Achaea. The bronze was to be deposited in the mint at Glarentza. On 8–9 June he directed two mint masters and a silver refiner of Messina to proceed immediately to Glarentza. Galeran d'Ivry was to receive them, "and to have the new coinage struck of the same value, the same weight, and the same form as the late Prince William of Achaea used to issue, and only the legend is to be changed, substituting the name of Charles for that of William."³³ To be sure, the aging William of Villehardouin had died on 1 May, 1278, and Charles of Anjou had succeeded him in the principality. Byzantine agents were watching Charles like so many hawks as he seemed to be moving eastward, now that he was prince of Achaea and suzerain of the Despot Nicephorus Ducas of Epirus, the self-proclaimed defender of Orthodoxy against the imperial unionist.

The Emperor Michael VIII had his successes too, for during the entire decade of the 1270's he had in his employ the notorious Latin adventurer Licario, who conquered most of Negroponte (Euboea) as well as various islands in the Archipelago. We shall return to Licario's career in connection with the Burgundian duchy of Athens.³⁴

³² Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliogr.*, I, 300; Minieri-Riccio, *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., II (1878), 198, 199. It required twenty horses, saddle and sumpter, to transport the despot's envoys from Barletta to Brindisi, and the Angevin bailie of Barletta was ordered to find the horses and send the envoys on their way the day after their arrival in his bailiwick.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 201–2, 203. On Galeran d'Ivry, see Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 254 ff., and on the Epirotes, Donald M. Nicol, "The Relations of Charles of Anjou with Nikephoros of Epiros," *Byzantinische Forschungen*, IV (Amsterdam, 1972), 170–94.

³⁴ On Licario, see Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes* (1873), pp. 119–20, 122–27; Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, V, 27 (Bonn, I, 410–13); Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, IV, 5 (Bonn, I, 95–97, 98); Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 2042, p. 72; Hopf, "Geschichte Griechenlands . . .," in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, eds., *Allgemeine Encyclopädie . . .*, vol. 85 (1867), pp. 304–6, 308–9 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 238–40, 242–43); Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 136–41, and *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, pp. 164 ff.; D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 295–99; and on the chronology of Licario's career, note the *regestes* in R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280," *Byzantion*, XXXV

It was indeed not a good time to receive papal envoys in Constantinople. Michael VIII had been having a great deal of difficulty with the independent John Beccus, who after some harassment had given up the patriarchal throne in March, 1279, and retired into the monastery of the Panachrantos,³⁵ thus leaving the political scene about the time the papal envoys came upon the emperor at Adrianople. Michael had been making a pretense of not accepting Beccus's abdication, and now required him to meet the papal envoys in the monastery of Mangana with no word of his own abandonment of the patriarchate. Michael found Nicholas III's demands disheartening, for he knew they would provoke bitter opposition from the Byzantine clergy. In a special assembly, however, he quietly warned the clergy of the pope's excessive requirements for union, which he attributed to reports the Latin religious in Pera must have been sending to Rome obviously to the effect that the Byzantines regarded the union as a religious farce, a mere political maneuver. Michael assured the clergy that he would not allow an iota to be added to the symbol even if it meant war with the Latins, but he asked the clergy to receive the envoys honorably and to hear them patiently.³⁶

The papal envoys had their say, and doubtless believed they were performing their functions well. To prove his determination to maintain the union of Lyon, Michael arranged that the envoys should visit the prisons where anti-unionists, including members of the imperial family, were held in chains.³⁷ John Beccus's pro-unionist views were well known, and he was now restored to office. On 6 August (1279) Beccus returned to the patriarchate, ostentatiously accompanied by a brilliant gathering of senators and high prelates. Now a synod could formally consider the papal demands. But once more the Greek clergy declined to take the required oath, as being contrary to their custom. The *filioque* clause was not inserted in the Greek symbol, and the clergy would do no more than prepare a synodal statement like that of April, 1277. There were so few

(1965), nos. 70, 77, 79, 82, 85, 87, 89, 94–96, 98, 102–3, pp. 256–65.

³⁵ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, VI, 13 (Bonn, I, 454–55). Pachymeres says that he wrote the libellus for the abdication; he was John Beccus's secretary.

³⁶ Pachymeres, VI, 14–15 (Bonn, I, 455–59).

³⁷ Pachymeres, VI, 16 (Bonn, I, 459–60).

subscribers to this statement, however, that Michael ordered the addition of numerous names of imaginary bishops to improve the impression which the document would make on the Curia Romana. Pachymeres admits that he did not know whether or not John Beccus gave his consent to this outrageous forgery. Dealing with the thorny problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the synodal statement cited numerous Greek patristic texts which sought to define the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son. None of the texts chosen, however, employed the decisive phrase *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι* (*ex filio procedere*); apparently the purpose of the Greeks was to bury the problem under a mass of citations. Although the statement concluded with the prescription of condign punishment for those who rejected the religious peace, there were certain to be those in the Curia who would assail the intransigence and tergiversation of the Greek clergy.³⁸

Michael VIII and his son Andronicus [II] renewed their professions of faith by oath in the palace of Blachernae in September, 1279, and letters to this effect were given to Bishop Bartolommeo of Grosseto and the Franciscan mission to carry back to Nicholas III.³⁹ But by now the good bishop and his companions realized their mission had not been a success. They had secured no concession, no gesture, that John XXI's embassy had not already gained, and they had obviously sacrificed much good-will at the Byzantine court.

When the Franciscans left Constantinople to return to Rome, they left Michael VIII to face increasing anti-unionist agitation, from the laity and secular clergy as well as from the monks. Michael responded angrily, even viciously, to the opposition, and embarked on a cruelty of repression which Pachymeres believed might better be written of with tears

than with ink (*τὰ δ' ἐκείνῳ τότε πραττόμενα δακρύοις μᾶλλον ἢ μέλανι γράφειν ἦν ἄξιον*).⁴⁰ Michael's violence inspired hatred which was directed also against the Patriarch John Beccus, whose intellectual defense of church union became intolerable for those who would no longer grant even its political utility.⁴¹

The Franciscan mission must have returned to the Curia Romana early in the year 1280, and one can easily imagine Pope Nicholas III's annoyance with the results which they had obtained. It may be that criticisms made by the Angevin party help to explain the imperious tone which the pope had allowed to enter the letters and instructions which the Franciscans had carried to Constantinople in the first place. As Cardinal Orsini, Nicholas had been the leader of the Roman faction at the Curia; his election had of course disappointed Charles of Anjou, who could now rejoice in the complete failure of the Franciscans to secure Byzantine obedience to the pope's demands. It was not the end of the union, but the union could not last.

Generations of so-called crusaders had thoroughly alienated the Greeks. Just as after the Cerularian Schism, the ambition of the Norman rulers of southern Italy had impeded efforts at ecclesiastical reunion, so Charles of Anjou had persistently sought to disrupt the religious peace of Lyon. But until the flat failure of Nicholas III's embassy to Constantinople there had been little he could do for the past half-dozen years. Michael VIII might try with increasing violence to force reunion on the Greek Church, just as John VIII was to exercise his influence to achieve it again at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (in 1438-1439). The simple fact was that neither the Greek hierarchy, despite John Beccus, nor the Greek people wanted reunion with Rome. The plenitude of papal power was incompatible with the pentarchic view of the Byzantine Church whereby the four eastern patriarchs, although recognizing the papal primacy of place, would accept neither the appellate jurisdiction nor the right of doctrinal declaration claimed by the Roman pontiffs. Many Greeks believed that

³⁸Pachymeres, VI, 17 (Bonn, I, 460-62), and cf. in general M. Viller, "La Question de l'union des églises entre Grecs et Latins depuis le concile de Lyon jusqu'à celui de Florence (1274-1438)," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XVII (1921), 264-65, and, *ibid.*, XVIII (1922), 46-47, an interesting but rather diffuse study.

³⁹The letters are given in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1280, nos. 19-22, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 478-80: "Praesens autem sacramentum actum est in nostra urbe felici Constantinopolitana in nostro sacro imperiali palatio Blachernarum mense Septembris indict. VIII anno sexto milleno septimo centeno octuagesimo octavo, hoc ipso nimirum Christianae salutis MCCLXXX feliciter. . . ." But the Byzantine new year and the eighth indiction began on 1 September, 1279. Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 2041, p. 72.

⁴⁰Pachymeres, VI, 24 ff. (Bonn, I, 483 ff.).

⁴¹On Beccus's defense of church union and the double procession of the Holy Spirit, cf. Grumel, "Le II^e Concile de Lyon," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (1926), cols. 1400-1; L. Bréhier, "Jean XI Beccos," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, VII (Paris, 1934), cols. 360-63.

the safety of the empire, with its God-guarded capital on the Bosphorus, depended upon the preservation of Orthodoxy.

Nicholas III had little time to assess the sad consequences of his embassy to Constantinople. He had been a busy pope. During his brief reign he had tried to hold in check the ambition of Charles of Anjou as well as to adjust the latter's difficulties with Rudolph of Hapsburg in order to secure peace in Italy.⁴² By the well-known constitution *Fundamenta militantis ecclesie* (of 18 July, 1278) he had prohibited election as Senator of Rome of any emperor, king, prince, marquis, duke, count, or baron without the express consent of the Apostolic See,⁴³ which prevented re-election to the office of Charles of Anjou, of whom he also demanded that he give up the imperial vicariate of Tuscany.⁴⁴ Although Charles's grip upon central Italy was thus loosened, he continued to press his policy of alliances with the anti-Greek states in the Balkans, and especially with Bulgaria.⁴⁵ On the other hand Nicholas III was interested in a possible Mongol-Christian alliance against Islam, and in the spring of 1278 he had sent a Franciscan mission to the Il-Khan Abagha of Persia, which was supposed to go on to the great Kubilai Khan in Peking.⁴⁶ Nicholas paid

lip service to the crusading idea, and commonly insisted upon payment of the crusading tithe, as provided for by the Council of Lyon, although as usual funds were diverted to other uses.⁴⁷ Nicholas was nothing if not a practical politician. He had too many problems and too many ambitions to spend his strength on what he doubtless regarded, for his reign at least, as an unattainable ideal, and he needed his resources to restore the independence of the papal states as well as to establish, if possible, the Orsini family in a hereditary domain in northern Italy.⁴⁸

A Roman by birth, Nicholas III spent most of his brief reign in the city which the popes had almost abandoned during the thirteenth century, although the summer heat might drive him to the pleasant height and green vistas of the palace at Viterbo. Since the Lateran needed rebuilding in his time, and Rome was often turbulent, Nicholas took up his residence at S. Peter's, where many of his letters were issued, and where he was almost the founder of the Vatican palace and the gardens.⁴⁹ Despite

⁴² Cf. Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, nos. 226, 302, 704 ff., 724, 728 ff., 765 ff., 797 ff., 847-48, 860, and cf. nos. 257, 684 ff., etc.

⁴³ Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 296, pp. 106-8.

⁴⁴ Cf. Gay and Vitte, *op. cit.*, nos. 303-4, 344 ff., 601, 604, 661, 705, 711, etc. Charles of Anjou's appointment as Senator of Rome expired on 16 September, 1278.

⁴⁵ There was an exchange of Bulgarian and Angevin embassies in 1278, on which note J. Radonić, *Acta et diplomata ragusina*, I (Belgrade, 1934), no. 39, p. 60, and R. Filangieri, *I Registri della cancelleria angioina*, XX (Naples, 1966), add. ad reg. LXXX, no. 5, p. 259.

⁴⁶ Gay and Vitte, *op. cit.*, nos. 232-38, pp. 88-90. Cf. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, V (1931), 39 ff. Actually Nicholas III's mission did not get beyond Persia (cf. É. Amann, "Nicolas III," *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, XI [Paris, 1931], cols. 534-35). There was also an exchange of embassies between Abagha and Charles of Anjou at this time (cf. Filangieri, *Registri*, XIX [1964], pp. 148, 150, 245).

The Franciscan mission consisted of Gerard of Prato, Antonio of Parma, John of S. Agatha, Andrea of Florence, and Matthew of Arezzo, who were entrusted with the delivery of a papal letter dated 4 April, 1278, to Kubilai Khan, who was believed in Rome to have accepted Christian baptism: "Carissimo in Christo filio Quobley magno Caano imperatori et moderatori omnium Tartarorum salutem et apostolicam benedictionem: . . . ab olim in eo Romana mater exultavit ecclesia et felicitis recordationis Johannes papa predecessor noster letitie incrementa suscepit quod de te per Abagua regem orientalium Tartarorum illustrem nepotem tuum suis extitit auribus intimatum, videlicet

quod dudum te gratia divina preveniens mentem tuam sua misericordie virtute commovit ut semitas erroris abiciens vias incederes veritatis recipiendo Christi baptismum ut sic regeneratus in Christo populo fidelium iungereris. Ex hoc tua fertur accensa devotio ut sacrosanctam Romanam reverearis ecclesiam, cultum diligas Christianum, et ipsos Christianos sub ditionis tue degentes imperio caritative foveas, favoribus munias, benigne pertractes, ac ipsos in libertate conserves. . . . [Nicholas III is sending the Franciscans to Peking to give proper instruction in the Christian faith to Kubilai Khan, his sons, 'and others of your people who have received no baptism thus far or have not received it in the required form.' In closing he asks for a kindly and co-operative reception of the mission.] Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum II nonas Aprilis anno primo" (Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 39, fols. 72^r-72^v). There are brief notices of this letter in Gay and Vitte, *op. cit.*, no. 233, p. 89, and Aug. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, no. 21,293 (vol. II, Berlin, 1875, p. 1722).

⁴⁷ Gay and Vitte, *op. cit.*, nos. 3, 8, 14, 62, 80-83, 110-11, 126, 131, 165-67, 186-88, 190, 193-94, 491, 537 ff., 761.

⁴⁸ Cf. Sternfeld, *Kardinal Johann Gaetan Orsini* (1905, repr. 1965), pp. 309-13.

⁴⁹ If any reliance can be placed in the Bolognese Dominican Francesco Pipino (1276-1314), *Chron.: de papa Nicolao III*, IV, 20, in Muratori, *RIS*, IX (Lucca, 1726), col. 724, Nicholas built his palace from the tithes of ecclesiastical revenues collected by Gregory X for the crusade (. . . *ex pecunia collecta de decima proventus universarum ecclesiarum occasione passagii, quod statuerat facere Gregorius X papa* . . .), and a similar statement appears in the *Chronicon imperatorum et pontificum Bavaricum*, in *MGH*, SS., XXIV (1879), 225, to the effect that Nicholas built a "miri operis palladium de marmore Rome . . . de pecunia decimali, quam Gregorius X universo clero pro subsidio terre Ierosolimitane inposuerat per sexennium. . . ." I take these references from

his predilection for Rome, however, Nicholas died, allegedly of apoplexy, at the castle of Soriano near Viterbo (on 22 August, 1280). A vigorous pope, he might have been a great one had he lived longer.

There is no question that hopes for a crusade were dimmed by the failure of Nicholas III's mission to Constantinople. Charles of Anjou saw his opportunity, and immediately after the return of the papal mission to the Curia Romana he was in communication with Giovanni Dandolo, the new doge of Venice, who on 28

April, 1280, appointed an embassy to treat with Charles and the Latin Emperor Philip of Courtenay:⁵⁰ despite the broad terms of their commission, the envoys were obviously to deal with the problem of the *imperium Romanie*.

After a papal interregnum of six months, during which time Charles of Anjou exerted such pressure as he could on the Sacred College, Cardinal Simon de Brion (or Brie) was elected pope in a conclave at Viterbo on 22 February, 1281. He took the name Martin IV. (As a result of the odd error, which existed at the time, of calling Popes Marinus I and Marinus II by the name of Martin, Cardinal de Brion became Martin IV whereas actually he was only the second of the name.) Opposition to the Orsini on the part of the populace of Viterbo, where the cardinals gathered in conclave, had helped frustrate the efforts of the Roman Guelfs to elect another pope of Nicholas III's party. The usual pattern of papal election had manifested itself: when the Italians could not agree in the conclave, a Frenchman emerged as pope. Martin was crowned at Orvieto (on 23 March) because Rome was in revolt. Indeed, the city was never entirely pacified although, on 29 April, Martin delegated to Charles of Anjou the senatorial authority. Martin never lived in Rome, and through the four years of his reign his hold upon the papal states remained precarious. A patriotic Frenchman and a tool in Angevin hands, Martin appointed too many of his compatriots to ecclesiastical and other offices. Far more seriously, he deliberately and dangerously reversed the wise policies of his Italian predecessors, Gregory X and Nicholas III, who had sought ecclesiastical union with the Greeks and the political repression of Charles of Anjou.⁵¹ For years all Europe had watched

Franz Ehrle and Hermann Egger, *Der Vaticanische Palast in seiner Entwicklung bis zur Mitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*, Città del Vaticano, 1935, p. 39 (in the *Studi e documenti per la storia del Palazzo Apostolico Vaticano*, vol. II).

Cardinal Ehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 27, has observed that we have no document of Nicholas III dated at the Lateran. The repairs and reconstruction undertaken in recent years in the oldest parts of the Vatican Palace, around the Cortile del Pappagallo, have added considerably to our knowledge of the early history and development of the papal residences on the hill to the north of S. Peter's. According to the *Gesta Innocentii PP. III*, chap. CXLVI, in *PL* 214, col. CCXIA [in a somewhat defective text], extensive construction was begun before 1208 by Innocent III, of whose works a sturdy tower and the understructure of a long hall still stand, embedded in the east wing of the *palatium novum* which Nicholas III built in 1278. Innocent's long hall, called the *aula tertia*, forms the older part of the (later) Sala Ducale, which Nicholas completed by the construction of the so-called *aula secunda*. (Pius IV revaulted the Sala Ducale in the third quarter of the sixteenth century.) Nicholas III also added the *aula prima*, now the Sala Regia.

The primary source for Nicholas's building activities at the Vatican is an inscription which was found off the Via Aurelia by one Monsignor F. Bianchini, who presented it to the Roman Senate in 1727. It is now on the Campidoglio, in the Sala dei Capitani of the Palazzo dei Conservatori: "†Anno domini MCCLXXVIII sanctissimus pater dominus Nicolaus Papa III^{us} fieri fecit palatia et aulam maiora [sic] et capellam, et alias domos antiquas amplificavit pontificatus sui anno primo, et anno secundo pontificatus sui fieri fecit circuitum murorum pomerii huius [i.e. 'of this garden', the plaque having been set in the garden wall]: fuit autem predictus summus pontifex natione Romanus ex patre domini Mathei Rubei de domo Ursinorum."

For thirteenth-century building north of S. Peter's and the papal acquisition of land and vineyards, see Ehrle and Egger, *Der Vaticanische Palast*, pp. 25–27, 33–52, 57, 71, with a good plate of the above inscription (Taf. II, opp. p. 40), and esp. D. Redig de Campos, "Les Constructions d'Innocent III et de Nicolas III sur la colline vaticane," in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXXI (1959), 359–76, and *idem*, *I Palazzi Vaticani*, Bologna: Cappelli, 1967, pp. 25–33, with various plans and drawings as well as a legible photograph of the inscription (fig. 11). The layout of the Vatican Palace becomes important as well as interesting in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when, for example, the ceremonial diarists identify the rooms in which certain dramatic historical events take place. On the eternal city in the thirteenth century, see Robert Brentano, *Rome before Avignon*, New York, 1974.

⁵⁰ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, III (Vienna, 1857), 287, 293–94, 303–4, and cf. Erwin Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik (1261 bis etwa 1310)*, Jena, 1938, pp. 54 ff. On 19 March, 1277, after the exchange of *multe et diverse ambaxate* between Venice and Constantinople, Michael VIII and the Doge Jacopo Contarini renewed for two years (*usque ad complementum duorum annorum*) the treaty which had obtained between the empire and the Republic (Tafel and Thomas, III, 134, 137). But this treaty had expired on 18 March, 1279, freeing the Venetians for negotiations with Charles of Anjou.

⁵¹ See in general Richard Sternfeld, "Das Konklave von 1280 und die Wahl Martins IV. (1281)," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXI (Inns-

with vast interest the spectacular career of Charles, and seemed actually to be divided into two great parties, one for and the other against him. There could have been little doubt where Cardinal de Brion stood in this alignment, and from the hour of his election as Martin IV he was, as he had always been, a French partisan.

In the meantime Michael VIII Palaeologus, probably not knowing of Nicholas III's death, had dispatched another embassy to the Curia Romana, consisting of Leo, bishop of Heraclea, and Theophanes, archbishop of Nicaea, who fell into the hands of Charles of Anjou. Leo and Theophanes were promptly sent as prisoners to the Curia in January, 1281. After his election Martin gave the Greek envoys a very cool reception, which Theophanes could later report to an indignant Michael, but poor Leo of Heraclea was to meet his death on the way home.⁵²

Their mission could not have been a success. On 3 July, 1281, envoys of the Doge Giovanni Dandolo confirmed at Orvieto a treaty with the Latin Emperor Philip and Charles of Anjou "for the recovery of the empire of Romania, which is held by Palaeologus and other usurpers . . ." (*ad recuperationem eiusdem imperii Romanie, quod detinetur per Paleologum et alios occupatores*. . .). If the allies succeeded in recovering the empire, they were to regain all the rights, liberties, properties, jurisdictions, lands, and franchises which they had respectively possessed during the years of Latin domination, and all the pacts which the Venetians had held with preceding Latin emperors, in both spiritual and temporal matters, were fully to be observed. Dandolo himself or his successor

as doge, the Latin Emperor Philip, and Charles of Anjou or the latter's son Charles of Salerno were to embark in person upon the reconquest of Constantinople. Philip and Charles were to supply about 8,000 horse with the requisite armed personnel and the transport (*videlicet naves et teridae*) while the Venetians would provide at least forty well-armed galleys and more if necessary. The high contracting parties should be ready to begin their expedition (*passagium*) in April, 1283. The doge would sail from Venice with his fleet on 1 April at the latest and Philip and Charles from Brindisi about 15 April at the latest, "so that in the said middle of this month all the vessels may be together at sea off Brindisi."⁵³

The allies signed another pact on the same day (3 July, 1281) wherein "it is decided and expressly agreed to send out and maintain galleys and transports at sea for seven months a year until such time as the [allies] shall make their passage into Romania against Palaeologus and the others who hold and occupy the empire of Romania. . . ." The Venetians were to supply fifteen armed galleys and the Angevins another fifteen galleys as well as ten transports (*teridae*) with 300 horse, the allied host to assemble at Corfu on 1 May, 1282, "ad faciendam guerram et dampnificandum Paleologum et alios. . . ." When the doge had added his lead seal to the instrument of agreement, and Philip of Courtenay and Charles of Anjou had added their seals in wax,⁵⁴ armed men set out to sea to harry the Byzantine coasts and islands and thus hinder Michael VIII's preparations for defense against the expedition which was to get under way in April, 1283.

For the last several years, ever since the declaration of union at Lyon, Charles of Anjou had had to defend himself against Greek incursions into his so-called kingdom of Albania. By an order dated at Lagopesole on 13 August, 1279, Charles had required that ships be readied

bruck, 1910), 1-53, who explores the historical background of the decade or more preceding Martin IV's election, as well as the family connections, political affiliations, and motives of the cardinals who made up the long conclave of 1280-1281. Five popes were elected in Viterbo in some twenty years. Charles of Anjou was not in the city at all during the years 1280-1281 (see his itinerary in Paul Durrieu, *Les Archives angevines de Naples*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886-87, II, 185-87), and his influence upon Martin's election was thus indirect. On Saba Malaspina's report concerning the election, note Sternfeld, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 24 ff., and on Saba's history of the Sicilian kingdom from Manfred to the death of Charles of Anjou, *ibid.*, pp. 45-53.

⁵² Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, VI, 30 (Bonn, I, 505-6); Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 2049, pp. 73-74. On the early life of Pope Martin IV, cf. Richard Kay, "Martin IV and the Fugitive Bishop of Bayeux," *Speculum*, XL (1965), 461-65 and ff.

⁵³ Tafel and Thomas, III, 287-95, treaty confirmed also on 2 August, 1281 (*ibid.*, III, 298-308). Cf. E. Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung d. latein. Herrschaft in Kpel.*, pp. 56-57; Nicola Nicolini, "Sui Rapporti diplomatici veneto-napoletani durante i regni di Carlo I e Carlo II d'Angiò," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, LX (n.s. XXI, 1935), 264-65; W. Norden, *Das Papsttum u. Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, p. 626, and note 2 on the date April, 1283; Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 337-38.

⁵⁴ Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III, 296-97, and cf. Dade, *Versuche*, pp. 57 ff.

for the embarkation of Hugh le Rousseau de Sully, whom he had just appointed captain and vicar of Albania. Sully was himself directed to go immediately to Brindisi with the considerable force under his command and thence to proceed on 22 August to Albania.⁵⁵ A large staff was being assembled and numerous troops recruited to serve under Sully against the forces of Michael VIII, whose aggressive stance in Albania was a source of extreme exasperation to Charles. From the late fall of 1279 Sully, who first established his headquarters at Spheonaritza (at the mouth of the Voyusa), and various other Angevin officials in Albania received constant reinforcements, including Saracen archers and a Latin engineer (*ingenierius*), as well as money, munitions, siege tackle, grain, wine, cheese, beans, and other provisions.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ L. de Thallóczy, *Const. Jireček, and Em. de Sufflay, Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia*, I (Vienna, 1913), no. 394, pp. 115–17. Both Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes* (1873), p. 129, and Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, VI, 32 (Bonn, I, 509), were obviously fascinated by the proud personality and handsome appearance of Sully, whom Pachymeres calls “Ros Solymas.” Cf. the curious study of George E. Tipaldou, “The ‘Ros Solymas’ of the Byzantines and the Rossolimi of Cephalonia” (in Greek), in the *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, II (Athens, 1925), 316–20, who seeks to show that the present-day family of the Rossolimi (Ροσόλυμοι) of Cephalonia are descended from Rousseau de Sully. Years ago Karl Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber’s *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), pp. 324–25 (repr. 1960, I, 258–59), wrote an excellent, detailed account of Sully’s Albanian campaign and unsuccessful siege of Berat from the archives of the Cancellaria Angioina in Naples which, stored for safekeeping in the Villa Montesano near S. Paolo Belsito during the Second World War, were destroyed on 30 September, 1943, on which cf. Ernesto Pontieri, “Rovine di guerra in Napoli,” *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, LXVIII (new ser., XXIX, 1943), 278–81, and E. M. Jamison, “. . . Angevin Registers . . .,” *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XVII (new ser., IV, 1949), 87–89. On the appointment of Sully as vicar-general of Albania, Durazzo, Avlona, Butrinto, Suboto, and Corfu on 13 August, 1279, see also Minieri-Riccio, “Il Regno di Carlo I d’Angiò . . .,” *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., II (1878), 355, and cf. pp. 360, 362. An emissary of Nicephorus Ducas was at the royal court at the time (*ibid.*, p. 356). The Ducae were always ready to do Michael VIII any damage they could.

⁵⁶ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, nos. 397–413, pp. 117–25. On the location of Sully’s headquarters in November, 1279, note, *ibid.*, no. 397, p. 118a: “. . . ad partes Spinarse, ubi gens ipsa cum capitaneo ipso [Hugone dicto Russo de Suliaco] moratur. . . .” Apparently Sully divided much of his time between Spheonaritza and nearby Avlona (*ibid.*, no. 418, p. 126). In this connection note the reference in the document summarized by C. Minieri-Riccio, “Il Regno di Carlo I d’Angiò . . .,” *Arch. stor. italiano*, 4th ser., III (1879), 165, to “Ugo detto Rosso de Sully, capitano di Romania, che sta a Spinarsa” (under date of 3 August, 1280).

The number of men and the quantity of material being sent into Albania made it abundantly clear that no mere defense of Angevin strongholds was intended.

A royal order of 29 June (1280) seems to place Sully’s army between Avlona and the inland fortress of Berat, and Sully required the engineer (named Johannes de Tullo), a carpenter from Foggia with two apprentices, and a good deal of heavy siege machinery obviously for the purpose of attacking either a castle or a fortified town. Since the document of 29 June directs our attention with especial emphasis toward Berat (*ad partes Belligradi*), we may assume that Sully had already invested the town, which was heavily fortified, or that he was about to do so.⁵⁷ Charles of Anjou had lost Berat to Michael VIII in 1274. Now he was determined to recover it.

Through the summer of 1280 Charles continued to send Sully men-at-arms, money, munitions, provisions, horses, timber, and even Greek fire.⁵⁸ According to Sanudo, Charles “intended to conquer the empire of Romania,” and supplied Sully “with some 2,000 men-at-arms or more as well as about 6,000 foot, among whom were a good many Saracens.” Berat was subjected to a prolonged siege, the

⁵⁷ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 413, p. 125, “datum . . . die penultimo Junii: Cum . . . subscriptas res que infra distinguuntur [the siege machinery and other equipment are listed later on in the document], ad nobilem virum Hugonem dictum Russum de Solliaco capitaneum nostrum in partibus Romanie . . . ad partes Belligradi providerimus destinandas—pro quarum destinatione festina ecce magistrum Johannem de Tullo ingenierium, etc., ad te [the ‘justiciar’ or governor of Capitanata, to whom the order is addressed] specialiter de curia nostra transmittimus. . . .” Berat was of course a very important place, the seat of a bishop. On Johannes de Tullo, cf. Charles of Anjou’s orders of 27 March and 9 September, 1280, in Minieri-Riccio, “Il Regno di Carlo I d’Angiò . . .,” *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., III (1879), 9, 166. In a document of 17 September, 1280, the names of about thirty carpenters, ironmongers, and stone-workers (*petraroli*) from Barletta are listed as being assigned to the construction of machines of war (*ibid.*, p. 168). On the employment of siege machinery against Berat, cf. Pachymeres, VI, 32 (Bonn, I, 510), *μηχανήματα πετροβόλα*.

⁵⁸ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, nos. 414–15, 418, 422–24, pp. 125–27. On 26 August, 1280, the castellan and treasurer of Avlona were directed to send Sully “de igne [*sic*] greco, quod [*sic*] est in castro nostro Avellone.” The large extent of Charles of Anjou’s preparations for Sully’s Albanian campaign may easily be envisaged from the details of his order relating to supply, dated 13 March, 1280, at Torre di S. Erasmo near Capua (Minieri-Riccio, *Arch. stor. italiano*, 4th ser., III, 7–8, and note various other documents to similar effect summarized by Minieri-Riccio in this article).

cost and labors of which can be assessed from the surviving documents.⁵⁹ Charles certainly felt the strain on his resources, but on 6 December (1280) he wrote Sully, joyfully acknowledging the news that the Angevin forces had occupied the outlying areas of Berat (*suburbia castris Bellogradi*), and informing him that he was sending a surgeon to care for his wounded men.⁶⁰ Thereafter, a letter dated at Naples in March (1281) to Jean Lescot, the captain of Durazzo, orders the latter to send all possible aid to Sully "to increase our fortunate army in the siege of the castle of Berat."⁶¹

Charles's uneasiness was caused by the slow, careful approach of the Byzantine forces which Michael VIII had dispatched to the relief of the threatened fortress.⁶² But apparently Charles had more to fear from the rashness of his commander than from the caution of his enemies. When at the beginning of April (1281) Sully was informed by his scouts that the Byzantines had arrived in the area of Berat and had even succeeded in getting some provisions into the beleaguered town, according to Sanudo, he "selected twenty-five of his knights, told them that he wanted to go and take a look at the enemies' army, and that he wanted them to come with him. . . ." Sully's bold advance led him directly into an ambush

which Turkish mercenaries in the Byzantine army clearly had set for him. The Turks seized Sully, in whom they were chiefly interested. Some members of his retinue escaped, and brought the alarming news of his capture to the Angevin host under the high walls of Berat.

Panic was instant, and Charles of Anjou's "fortunate army" was soon in headlong flight, past Clissura to Canina (near the coast southeast of Avlona). Many were killed, and many others taken prisoner. The Greeks took over the Angevin siege machinery, munitions, arms, provisions, and other supplies of all kinds. "Messer Rousseau [de Sully] was taken to Constantinople," Sanudo tells us, "with many of his people, and they were put in prison where they remained many years: finally he was freed and returned to the kingdom of Puglia, and certainly these things did not happen without God's own high judgment and great cause. . . ."⁶³

Delighted by the extraordinary success of his troops, the Emperor Michael VIII gave especial thanks to God, who had given him the victory (*χειρας δ'αἶρει πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν χάριν τρανῶ τῷ στόματι*), celebrated a public triumph, and had murals painted in the imperial palace, presumably at Blachernae, depicting among other victories that at Berat.⁶⁴ Michael had not enjoyed a like success over his Latin opponents since Pelagonia over twenty years before. Certainly his unionist negotiations had gained him time, and appear to have delayed

⁵⁹ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, nos. 425–40, 443–48, pp. 128–31, 132–33; Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes*, p. 129. Pachymeres, VI, 32 (Bonn, I, 509), and Nicephorus Gregoras, V, 6, 2 (Bonn, I, 146), also agree that, after taking Berat, Charles of Anjou planned to sweep through Macedonia and attack Constantinople. He tried to clear the road into Macedonia, and also put other castelli in the region of Berat under siege (Minieri-Riccio, *Arch. stor. italiano*, 4th ser., III, 165, under date of 4 August, 1280).

⁶⁰ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 441, pp. 131–32. Charles wants Sully to hasten the capture of the fortress by "frequent assaults" (*frequentes insultus*).

⁶¹ *Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 449, p. 133, doc. dated by the editors 12 March, 1281, but should probably be 22 March (cf., *ibid.*, no. 450, p. 133b), as it is dated in Hopf's article in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 325a (repr. 1960, I, 259a). Jean Lescot, who appears in Minieri-Riccio's summaries of the Angevin documents as Giovanni Scotto (*Johannes Scottus*), and likewise in Francesco Carabellese, *Carlo d'Angiò nei rapporti politici e commerciali con Venezia e l'Oriente*, Bari, 1911, pp. 33, 71, 87 ff., was of course a Frenchman (cf. Paul Durrieu, *Les Archives angevines de Naples*, II [1887], 338). Almost no Italians occupied positions of command in the Angevin military or civil service at this time.

⁶² Pachymeres, VI, 32 (Bonn, I, 510, 512). Sully continued to receive reinforcements through March, 1281 (Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., IV [1879], 5, 6) and even later (*ibid.*, p. 14).

⁶³ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 129; Pachymeres, VI, 32 (Bonn, I, 512–15); Nic. Gregoras, V, 6, 4–5 (Bonn, I, 147–48). On the date of Sully's capture, cf. Hopf's article, *loc. cit.*, and on the siege of Berat and its historical significance, cf. also Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus* (1959), pp. 329–34. That the Angevin army was defeated and Sully captured at the beginning of April, as Hopf, *loc. cit.*, states, clearly follows from a letter of Charles of Anjou dated at Orvieto on 17 April, 1281 (*Acta et diplomata Albaniae*, I, no. 451, pp. 133–34): that Charles knew the fate of his army on this date clearly follows from his request for an inventory of the goods of his troops at Berat, ". . . tam ab illis de hospicio nostro quam stipendiariis nostris olim in obsidione castris Bellogradi. . . ." Sully's imprisonment, however, did not last as long as Sanudo believed, since his name stands at the head of a list of French lords in the Angevin service in November, 1282 (Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., IV [1879], 357). Cf. in general Sanudo's reflections on the events of these years in a letter addressed to Cardinal Bertrand du Poujet, composed at Venice on 10 April, 1330, in Friedrich Kunstmann, "Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren," *Abhandlungen der historischen Classe der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, VII (1855), app., ep. II, pp. 773–74.

⁶⁴ Pachymeres, VI, 33 (Bonn, I, 516–19).

a full-scale Angevin attack upon the Byzantine empire for some half-dozen years. After Berat, Charles of Anjou's smoldering hatred against Michael burst into a new flame, if one can use the metaphor of the cold-blooded pragmatist, who now set about organizing a larger expedition against Byzantium than any he had planned before, and this time (as we have seen) in alliance with the Venetians, who were no more reconciled than he to the Greek reconquest of 1261. As he worked toward the expedition which was to assemble at Brindisi in April, 1283, Charles now had, and for the first time, the full and unrelenting assistance of the papacy.

Pope Martin IV was an Angevin zealot. On 18 November, 1281, he promulgated a solemn bull of excommunication against "Michael Palaeologus, who is called emperor of the Greeks," and who like his people was a schismatic and a heretic. The pope forbade all rulers to form any *societas vel confederatio* with him or to give him aid or counsel so long as he remained under the ban.⁶⁵ The decree was repeated on 7 May and on 18 November, 1282,⁶⁶ and the "union" of the Churches was entirely shattered, to the pious disapproval of the Venetian Marino Sanudo, as half a century later he pondered these rapidly moving events.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, II (Berlin, 1875), no. 21,815; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1281, no. 25, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 490–91, "in festo dedicationis basilicae principis apostolorum, pontificatus nostri anno primo" [the dedication of the basilicas of both S. Peter and S. Paul in Rome comes on 18 November]. The date of the first excommunication of Michael VIII is given incorrectly as 18 October (1281) by Dade, *Versuche*, p. 58, and Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, p. 341, but correctly as 18 November by É. Amann, "Martin IV," in *Dictionn. de théologie catholique*, X-1 (Paris, 1928), col. 195. The bull was promulgated at Orvieto, a Guelf city, which after Urban IV's two years' residence there (in 1262–1264) had become an Angevin center: except for a brief interval Martin IV resided at Orvieto from the spring of 1281 until the summer of 1284 (cf. in general Daniel Waley, *Mediaeval Orvieto*, Cambridge, 1952, pp. 44–53).

⁶⁶ Potthast, *Regesta*, II, nos. 21,896 and 21,948; F. Olivier-Martin, ed., *Les Registres de Martin IV (1281–1285)*, 3 fascs., 1901–35, nos. 269, 278, pp. 100–1, 115–16; Raynaldus, ad ann. 1282, nos. 8–9, vol. XXII (1870), 495–96, "actum apud Urbemveterem [Orvieto] . . . in die Ascensionis Domini . . ." (Ascension comes forty days after Easter, hence on 7 May in 1282 when Easter fell on 29 March), and, *ibid.*, no. 10, p. 496, when Michael VIII was excommunicated for the third time, as Raynaldus remarks, "recurrente festo dedicationis principis apostolorum" (i.e. again on 18 November). Cf. Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV, cols. 475 ff.

⁶⁷ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 138.

One fact was obvious in Constantinople, Rome, and Naples: Michael VIII needed an ally. To informed observers of the time it was equally obvious where he might find one.

King Pedro III of Aragon-Catalonia had married the ill-starred Manfred's daughter Constance. She had not relaxed her claims to the Hohenstaufen kingdom of Sicily. Ghibelline refugees from Sicily and southern Italy gathered at the Catalan court in Barcelona, where they never ceased to importune Constance to remember her rights and Don Pedro to give them substance. Recent historians have studied the lives and legends of Giovanni da Procida and Benedetto Zaccaria, both of whom played important roles in the diplomacy which led to the Graeco-Catalan collaboration against Charles of Anjou. It is now known, however, that from the year 1279 until the spring of 1282, when the alleged arch-conspirator Giovanni da Procida was supposed to be making his secret trips to Rome, Sicily, and Byzantium, he was too frequently resident in Aragon-Catalonia, where he served Don Pedro as chancellor, to have traveled abroad often enough and far enough to weave the diplomatic web in which Charles of Anjou was finally caught. Contemporaries understood that Michael VIII and Don Pedro possessed a common bond in their hostility to Charles. What finally proved to be surprising, then, was not so much the fact of collaboration as its overwhelming effectiveness.

Whether one believes that a formal alliance existed between Don Pedro III and Michael VIII may depend upon one's definition of the term. No text of an alliance exists in which the obligations of the contracting parties are specified, but the Dominican chronicler Ptolemy of Lucca, writing in the early fourteenth century, seems clearly to say that he once saw the text of such a treaty, designed to take Charles of Anjou's kingdom from him.⁶⁸ Don Pedro

⁶⁸ Ptolemy of Lucca, *Hist. ecclesiastica*, in Muratori, *R.I.S.S.*, XI (Lucca, 1727), cols. 1186–87: "Primo namque assumuntur mediatores inter Palaeologum et regem Aragonum, qui vocabatur Petrus, qui uxorem habebat filiam Manfredi, quae vocabatur domina Constantia. Hi autem fuerunt mediatores: unus fuit dominus Benedictus Zacharias de Janua cum quibusdam aliis Januensibus, qui domini erant in terra Palaeologi. Alius autem fuit dominus Joannes de Procida. Et hi, praecipue autem dominus Joannes, mediatores fuerunt inter unum de majoribus principibus mundi et regem Aragonum supradictum de auferendo regnum regi Carolo: quem tractatum ego vidi. Sed illi regi succurrit Palaeo-

appears to bear witness to the same effect in a letter of January, 1282, to the Ghibelline government of Pisa, from whom he wanted assistance against Charles:

Since it is well understood that Charles, like the wretched miscreant he is, plans soon to attack the emperor of Constantinople, who has become bound to us by a tie of recent friendship [*nove amicitie linea nobis unitus*], we have taken the heart-felt resolution firmly to oppose the reckless ambitions of this king to the full extent of our power. It is our intention therefore . . . to go into the kingdom of Sicily and there to remain . . . with our army, and so when the king begins to believe tales of his conquest of the Greeks, the Sicilians will find themselves unmistakably subject to our dominion.⁶⁹

In the interesting bull of 18 November, 1282, by which Martin IV imposed the long-expected ban of excommunication upon Don Pedro III of Aragon—at the same time as he pronounced the ban for the third time on Michael VIII—general reference is made to the *pacta, conventiones et confederationes* which, the Curia Romana had by then become convinced, existed between the two allies.⁷⁰ The purpose of such a Graeco-Catalan coalition would presumably be to attack Charles in Sicily, where he was the most vulnerable. Pedro III could thus assert his wife's rights to the island, and

Michael VIII would perforce be content with any move which deflected Charles from striking at Byzantium. Michael would claim, in the memoir of his achievements, to have been the instrument which God chose to help the Sicilians throw off the Angevin yoke and gain their freedom.⁷¹ The contemporary Franciscan chronicler Salimbene of Parma suggests that Pope Nicholas III, who as Cardinal Orsini had headed the Roman or anti-Angevin party at the Curia Romana, had helped prepare the way for Don Pedro's Sicilian expedition because of his hatred for Charles, being supported in this endeavor by the cardinals pledged to the Orsini allegiance.⁷² Salimbene is probably reporting current rumor, which was taken up by later writers including Dante and Giovanni Villani. It seems most unlikely, however, that Nicholas III was a party to the conspiracy which had certainly been formed against Charles of Anjou by Pedro III, Michael VIII, various Sicilian leaders, and some of the Italian Ghibellines.⁷³ As every reader of history knows, the conspiracy produced startling results.

⁷¹ Michael VIII, *De vita sua*, chap. IX, ed. H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, XXIX–XXX (1959–60), 461. Perhaps we may observe here that Michael's titular rival, the Latin Emperor Philip of Courtenay, served as a commander for Charles of Anjou in Sicily against Pedro of Aragon (Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., V [1880], 179).

⁷² Cf. Salimbene [degli Adami], *Cronica*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH*, SS., XXXII (1905–13, repr. 1963), 517: "Siquidem papa Nicholaus III dederat eam [Siciliam] sibi [Petro] in odium regis Karuli cum consensu aliquorum cardinalium, qui tunc erant in curia, et ipse Petrus rex Aragonie ex alia parte credebatur se aliquid in ea iuris habere, quia Manfredi principis gener fuerat"—on which cf. Sternfeld, "Vertrag zwischen dem Paläologen Michael VIII u. Peter von Aragon," pp. 282–83, and "Das Konklave von 1280 . . .," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXI (1910), 19 ff.

⁷³ Too little is known of the mission of Pedro III's emissary A. Taberner in 1278–1279 "pro quibusdam nostris negociis ad Curiam Romanam et ad dominum imperatorem" (Helene Wieruszowski, "Conjuraciones y alianzas políticas del rey Pedro de Aragón contra Carlos de Anjou antes de las Vísperas Sicilianas," *Boletín de la Academia de la Historia*, CVII [Madrid, 1935], 561–63, 591–92) to assume that Nicholas III was willing to support the Graeco-Catalan coalition against Charles of Anjou even if the *dominus imperator* in question was in fact Michael VIII and Taberner discussed with Nicholas a Catalan expedition against Sicily.

logus propter novitates eidem factas, et cum suo adiutorio facit armatam in mari." See in general Richard Sternfeld, "Der Vertrag zwischen dem Paläologen Michael VIII und Peter von Aragon im Jahre 1281," in the *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, VI (Leipzig, 1918), 276–84. Ptolemy settled in Avignon (in 1309), where he finished his history of the church, which comes down to 1294. As Sternfeld suggests, Ptolemy may have seen the "treaty" of alliance (in Rome?) when as prior of the convent in Lucca from 1288 he was entrusted with important business on behalf of the Dominican Order, and presumably found himself at the Curia Romana on diverse occasions.

⁶⁹ Fritz Kern, *Acta Imperii, Angliae et Franciae (1267–1313)*, Tübingen, 1911, doc. no. 28, p. 17, and cf. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, pp. 348–49, who rightly stresses the importance of this text.

⁷⁰ Olivier-Martin, *Registres de Martin IV*, no. 276, p. 112. The pope states that *vox . . . publica et communis* accuses Pedro III and Michael VIII of an alliance *contra nos*, . . . *Ecclesiam et regem Carolum*. . . . The ban was repeated against Pedro III a year later on 18 November, 1283, in the *dedicationis basilice principis apostolorum* (*ibid.*, no. 482, pp. 220–22, and cf. nos. 571, 573, 577).

8. THE SICILIAN VESPERS AND A CENTURY OF ANGEVIN DECLINE (1282–1383)

ON EASTER MONDAY, 30 March, 1282, a crowd was gathering in the square by the century-old church of Santo Spirito, to the south-east of the city walls of Palermo. People were coming from the city and the countryside to hear the vesper service. Suddenly an irate husband slew a French soldier who was molesting his wife. He made history. Every Frenchman in the square perished within minutes as the bells of Santo Spirito tolled the extraordinary hour of the "Sicilian Vespers." The massacre of the French spread from day to day and week to week throughout most of the island, and an Angevin fleet was destroyed in the harbor of Messina—the fleet which Charles of Anjou had intended to send against Byzantium. Within a few weeks it was clear that Charles's "crusade" would have to be postponed indefinitely, and when on 30 August Don Pedro III of Aragon finally landed at Trapani, it was clear that Charles of Anjou had lost the chance to attack Byzantium.

The Sicilian Vespers, *quod miraculosum fuit*, as a Genoese chronicler describes it in his excited account,¹ astonished Europe and aroused much comment and speculation in the Levant.²

¹ L. T. Belgrano and C. Imperiale, eds., *Annali genovesi*, V (1929), 16–20.

² Of the large literature on the Sicilian Vespers and its consequences, reference may here be made to Bartolommeo di Neocastro, *Historia sicula*, chaps. 14 ff., ed. Giuseppe Paladino, in Muratori, *RiSS*, XIII, pt. 3 (Bologna, 1921), 11 ff.; Salimbene, *Cronica*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH*, SS., XXXII (1905–13, repr. 1963), 508–10, 512, 513, 517, 523 ff., 564–65; Ricordano Malispini, *Storia fiorentina*, Livorno, 1850, chaps. 220 ff., pp. 504 ff., and in a much better edition by Enrico Sicardi, *Due Cronache del Vespro in volgare siciliano del secolo XIII* (containing the *Rebellamentu di Sicilia . . . contra re Carlu* by an anonymous writer of Messina and the *Vinuta e lu suggiornu di lu re Japicu in la gitati di Catania* [in the year 1287] by Frate Athanasius di Jaci, as well as an appendix of other pertinent texts), in *RiSS*, XXXIV, pt. 1 (Bologna, 1922), pp. 81 ff., appendix 3. Sicardi discusses the historical value of the Sicilian literary sources in a long introduction (they add valuable data to contemporary letters and documents, but are frequently untrustworthy). Of secondary works it may suffice here to cite Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1282, nos. 11 ff., vol. XXII (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), pp. 496 ff.; the famous work of Michele Amari, *La Guerra del Vespro Siciliano*, 9th ed., 3 vols., Milan, 1886; Otto Cartellieri, *Peter von Aragon und die sizilianische Vesper*, Heidelberg, 1904, esp. pp. 138 ff.; Helene Wieruszowski, "Der Anteil Johanns von Procida an der Verschwörung gegen Karl von Anjou," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* (Spanische Forschungen

Two facts were certain, however, and may be stated briefly. Until the conflict between the houses of Anjou and Aragon was resolved, there could be no possibility of a successful crusade, and without such help the remnants of the Latin states in the Holy Land could not long survive. Of course Byzantium would last until it faced a more powerful enemy than Charles of Anjou and one closer at hand. In the meantime Pope Martin IV began pouring crusading tithes and other revenues into the war against Pedro III of Aragon,³ whom he accused of deceiving the Curia with the expect-

d. Görresgesellschaft, 1st ser.), V (Münster, 1935), 230–39, also "Conjuraciones y alianzas políticas del rey Pedro de Aragón contra Carlos de Anjou antes de la Visperas Sicilianas," *Boletín de la Academia de la Historia*, CVII (Madrid, 1935), 547–602, with twenty new documents (Miss Wieruszowski's two articles have been recently reprinted in the collection of her works entitled *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*, Rome, 1971, pp. 173–83, 223–78, the latter being given in a revised German version, "Politische Verschwörungen und Bündnisse König Peters von Aragon gegen Karl von Anjou am Vorabend der sizilianischen Vesper," from the *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXXVII [1957], 136–91); Erwin Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel . . .*, Jena, 1938, pp. 59 ff.; Giuseppe La Mantia, "Studi sulla rivoluzione siciliana del 1282," *Archivio storico per la Sicilia*, VI (1940), 97–135; Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958, pp. 201 ff.; and D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 344 ff. There is a survey of some of the sources in C. N. Tsirpanlis, "The Involvement of Michael VIII Palaeologus in the Sicilian Vespers (1279–1282)," in the Greek periodical *Byzantina*, IV (Thessaloniki, 1972), 303–29. Don Pedro had gathered his naval and land forces for the Sicilian venture under the guise of a crusade against the Moslems in North Africa (cf. Wieruszowski, "Conjuraciones y alianzas . . .," pp. 583 ff.; *Politics and Culture* [cited above], pp. 255–64; and La Mantia, "Studi sulla rivoluzione siciliana," pp. 101–3). According to the Angevin records summarized by Camillo Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., IV (1879), 174–75, on 7 April, 1282, Charles of Anjou ordered the arming for his Greek expedition of a fleet of twenty-two galleys and eight transports, which according to an entry under 11 April "dovranno navigare verso l'isola di Sicilia" (*ibid.*)—the Sicilian Vespers had occurred twelve days before, and Charles now changed his mind (*di avere mutato consiglio*) about sending the fleet into Romania!

³ Adolf Gottlob, *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-Steuern des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Heiligenstadt (Eichsfeld), 1892, pp. 116 ff.

tation of peace while entering into a treacherous conspiracy against Charles.⁴

Already very heavily in debt, Charles found his revenues markedly reduced by the loss of Sicily. Don Pedro III and the Catalans soon occupied the island in its entirety. Although grasping, Charles was certainly not niggardly. But he found life a costly business. His financial accounts, which Minieri-Riccio published years ago in brief summaries from the records of the Cancelleria Angioina in Naples, show Charles to have been reasonably generous to his retainers and to ecclesiastics, anxious to build up his library, and constantly alert to the needs of his armed forces. His administration in the Regno was expensive; it was also rather corrupt, and his taxation bore heavily on his subjects.

Even Léon Cadier, who has defended Charles of Anjou's administration in the kingdom of Sicily, cannot deny the harsh fiscal policy of his rule. As suzerains of the kingdom, however, the popes played a dominant role in Neapolitan and Sicilian affairs, and were in part responsible (says Cadier) for the mistakes of policy which helped to precipitate the Vespers. The terms set by the papacy for investing Charles with the kingdom had prohibited his levying imposts upon ecclesiastical lands, and he was further bound to respect the freedom, immunities, and privileges of all men in the entire kingdom, and to maintain such privileges as had existed in

the time of good King William II (1166–1189) and the days of yore.⁵

The first Angevins could easily be charged with violating King William's good usages since no one ever found out what these usages really were. Charles followed the models he found in the kingdom when he conquered it, and these were the malpractices of the Emperor Frederick II and his son Manfred. Charles's administration was merely more efficient, which prevented abuses but also aroused hostility. Charles increased his always inadequate revenues by the confiscation of Ghibelline properties, revocation of Hohenstaufen grants, expropriation of the assets of Sicilian rebels, full exploitation of the royal domain, and the vigilant collection of general and extraordinary "aids" (the *subventio generalis*), customs and port duties, land taxes, market tolls, exit visas (*jura exiturae*), exchange and sales taxes, and returns from the salt monopoly, as well as by the most stringent interpretation of feudal law, which by and large he applied equally to his French and Italian subjects. But certainly there were royal officials and French feudatories, of whom some remained in the southern kingdom unwillingly, who were rapacious enough to exacerbate the feelings of the Sicilians, especially when the latter finally found themselves almost entirely excluded from the governance of the island.⁶

⁴ See Martin IV's bull excommunicating Pedro III of Aragon, dated 18 November, 1282 (F. Olivier-Martin, ed., *Les Registres de Martin IV* [1901–35], no. 276, p. 109b): "... pacem expectavimus et turbini gravioris tempestas apparuit, machinatis iam dudum, ut communis quasi fert opinio, et subsecutorum consideratio satis indicat evidenter, dolis et insidiis revelatis." On the fact of conspiracy, which Amari always denied in his effort to see the Vespers as a spontaneous uprising of Sicilian patriots against French tyranny, cf. Wieruszowski, "Conjuraciones y alianzas," pp. 549 ff., and La Mantia, "Studi sulla rivoluzione siciliana," esp. pp. 101 ff. As is well known, Pedro was on a "crusade" at Collo, north of Constantine, against the Hafšids of Tunis when two Sicilian delegations waited on him in mid-August. They brought him an urgent appeal to intervene on the rebels' behalf against Charles of Anjou, who was quickly making plans for the reconquest of the island. Charles-Emmanuel Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalane et le Maghrib aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, Paris, 1966, pp. 248–59, claims with good reason that Pedro's North-African venture was a serious undertaking in itself although the Sicilian Vespers gave him a fine opportunity for the profitable diversion to Sicily as his campaign against the Hafšids was failing.

⁵ Cf. Clement IV's bull *Cum iamdudum tractatum* of 26 February, 1265, in J. C. Lünig, *Codex Italiae diplomaticus*, II (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1726), cols. 945 ff.: "... Item comites, barones, milites, et universi homines totius regni et terrae praedictae vivent in ea libertate, et habebunt illas immunitates illaque privilegia, ipsisque gaudebunt, quas et quae tempore clarae memoriae Guillelmi secundi Siciliae regis et aliis antiquis temporibus habuerunt" (col. 962). On this text, cf. L. Cadier, *Essai sur l'administration du royaume de Sicile sous Charles I et Charles II d'Anjou*, Paris, 1891, pp. 10–11, and Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1265, no. 20, vol. XXII (1870), p. 152b.

⁶ Paul Durrieu, *Les Archives angevines de Naples*, I (Paris, 1886), 75–76, has emphasized that a study of the Angevin registers gives a favorable impression of Charles of Anjou's efforts to maintain justice and social security in the kingdom of Sicily. Charles adopted for his realm the French institution of permanent commissions of inquiry (*inquisitores curiae*) to hear complaints against, and to correct the abuses of, all royal functionaries. On the multiplicity of taxes collected in the kingdom of Sicily (and inherited from Frederick II and Manfred), see Durrieu, I, 90 ff. Protesting against Michele Amari's sweeping condemnation of Angevin administration in Sicily (in *La Guerra del Vespro Siciliano*), Léon Cadier, *Essai sur l'administration du royaume de Sicile*, esp. pp. 10–54, 62 ff., has described at some length Charles's efforts to provide the kingdom with a sound administration and to prevent official abuses of

Charles of Anjou's revenues seem rarely to have equaled his expenditures, and he often turned to Martin IV for help. From the beginning of his reign Martin seems to have been scrupulously attentive to financial matters (partly perhaps because of Charles's constant need), and he used the *subsidiū Terrae Sanctae* as a device to raise money. Possessing the ecclesiastical mentality of his time, Martin was of course theoretically devoted to the crusading ideal, and he was always eager to persuade the faithful to make testamentary bequests to promote the crusade.⁷ But once crusading funds were collected, the pope was accountable to no one for their disposition. On 18 March, 1282, before the Sicilian Vespers, Martin granted Charles of Anjou the crusading tithe for six years in both the island of Sardinia and the kingdom of Hungary. Since Charles professed to be a crusader, this was quite in accord with the decree of the Second Council of Lyon.⁸ The object of Charles's "crusade" was of course Byzantium although one commonly spoke of the perils of Christians in the Holy Land. Charles would rescue them after the re-establishment of the Latin empire on the Bosphorus. Before November, 1283, however, Martin had also granted Charles certain

all kinds, and has shown that Charles's grand ordinance of reform of 10 June, 1282, was to an important extent a repetition of laws and royal orders issued before the Vespers. Nevertheless, Cadier, *op. cit.*, p. 53, concedes that the Angevin administration weighed heavily on some parts of the realm (and notably on Sicily, *op. cit.*, p. 63), and provoked complaints against excesses and oppressions. The preface to Charles's grand ordinance of reform makes clear that his subjects had been sadly mishandled by corrupt officials, and the prince of Salerno's articles of reform (of 30 March, 1283) confirm the fact (*op. cit.*, pp. 77-96).

⁷ Cf. in general Olivier-Martin, *Registres de Martin IV*, nos. 4, 22, 25-34, 54, 74-76, 79, 81, 86-87, 116, 119-21, 140-45, 150 ff., etc., 161, 163, 180, 204, 222-23. The crusading tithe was still diligently collected after the Vespers when it would obviously be used not against the Moslems but against the Catalans (*ibid.*, nos. 244-45, 247-48, 272-74, 286, etc., 350-52, 356, etc.), which caused the complaint reported to the Curia Romana by a collector, "qui in litteris suis significaverat in Alamaniae partibus dolosam linguam disseminare quod decimam Terrae Sanctae subsidio deputatam in usus alios nequiter ecclesia Romana converteret . . ." (*ibid.*, no. 244, pp. 84-85, papal letter dated at Orvieto on 13 January, 1283). When on 12 January, 1284, Martin IV wrote that "the business of the Holy Land is especially close to our heart," *Terre Sancte negotio cordi nobis specialiter insidente* (*ibid.*, no. 433, p. 178), it is hard to escape the conclusion that he is thinking only of collecting funds which he knows perfectly well will never see service against the Moslems. Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1283, nos. 39 ff., vol. XXII (1870), pp. 519 ff.

⁸ Olivier-Martin, *Registres de Martin IV*, no. 116, pp. 43-44.

ecclesiastical tithes (presumably of the Angevin domains in Italy) for two years "to aid him in the expenses of the war against Sicily."⁹ When one adds the specificity of figures to the general grants of tithes and the like, it becomes clear that we are dealing with very large sums of money.

On 12 November, 1283, for example, Charles of Anjou's son, the prince of Salerno, sent two emissaries to the Curia Romana to receive from Pope Martin IV a loan of 100,000 ounces of gold to help arm a fleet for an expedition against the native rebels and the Catalan invaders of Sicily.¹⁰ Three months later, on 13 February (1284), Charles of Salerno acknowledged the receipt from Martin of 10,000 ounces of gold for the Sicilian war, and at the same time was given another 28,393 ounces and 14 grains of gold, which amount the pope paid in gold florins at the rate of five to an ounce.¹¹ Shortly thereafter, on 25 February, Charles of Salerno made due acknowledgment to the pope for the receipt of 50,000 ounces of gold, of the sum being loaned to his father "per le spese della impresa di Sicilia." At the same time Charles received 1,000 ounces of gold from Gino Frescobaldi and his associates, Florentine merchants, and another 10,000 ounces of gold from other merchants, "e tutti per le spese della guerra."¹² If the entire loan of 100,000 ounces is reckoned on the basis of five florins to an ounce (the ratio remained much the same for decades), obviously the Angevins expected the Holy See to finance the recovery of Sicily to the extent of 500,000 florins, which was probably the total fixed income of the papacy for some eighteen months. The kingdom of Sicily was, to be sure, a papal fief, and Charles of Anjou was the pope's vassal, but one may be permitted the suggestion that

⁹ Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Arch. stor. ital.*, 4th ser., V (1880), 360: ". . . per soccorrerlo nelle spese della guerra contro la Sicilia."

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, V (1880), 358-59, and cf. p. 361. Charles of Salerno was then ruling as vicar-general for his father, who was out of the kingdom (Durrieu, *Archives angevines*, I [1886], 140, and II [1887], 139). On the loans, cf. Cadier, *Essai sur l'administration du royaume de Sicile*, p. 101, who observes that Charles of Anjou had authorized his son to borrow up to 100,000 ounces of gold, but does not note that this sum was expected from the pope. Since Charles also soon sought a loan of 20,000 marks of silver from Edward I of England and lesser sums from other Florentine and Lucchese bankers, he was obviously prepared for a higher indebtedness than 100,000 ounces of gold.

¹¹ Minieri-Riccio, *op. cit.*, VII (1881), 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, VII (1881), 8-9, and cf. the entries under 27 February (*ibid.*, p. 9) and 3 September (p. 304).

Charles's expectations of his suzerain were excessive. Nevertheless, Martin IV's response to his requests appears to have been unhesitating. Papal pressure was constantly put on the Guelf bankers to extend further credit to the Angevins. The French lost Sicily largely as a result of their own harshness and arrogance although the success of the islanders' revolt obviously owed much to Byzantine money and Catalan troops. Certainly Martin IV gave Charles of Anjou all the help he could.

The Angevins now began their long effort to reconquer Sicily, which inevitably distracted their attention and resources from Moreote affairs. The French principality of Achaea had all the weakness of a feudal state and none of the strength of the centralized monarchy upon which it depended. It was a political anachronism by the close of the thirteenth century. The rights of William of Villehardouin's daughter Isabelle, signed away by her father, as we have seen, in the treaty of Viterbo (1267), were to be restored for a time by Charles II (1289). Perhaps Charles was moved to do this by the intervention of Philip IV the Fair on Isabelle's behalf. In any event Isabelle was to reign as princess of Achaea with her two later husbands—Florent of Hainaut (1289–1297), a great-grandson of the Latin Emperor Baldwin I, and Philip of Savoy (1301–1307), a nephew of Count Amadeo V—but the glorious past of the Villehardouin did not return to the Morea for all that a daughter of their house bore the princely title.

For twenty years after the Vespers, until the peace of Caltabellotta in 1302, the Neapolitan house of Anjou required all its strength for the struggle with the house of Barcelona.¹³ Many Moreote knights fought in the Angevin armies against the Catalans, Aragonese, Sicilians, and peninsular Ghibellines, who opposed the re-establishment of French rule in the island kingdom of Sicily (*Trinacria*). Fortunately for the principality of Achaea, however, and perhaps for the Angevin kingdom of Naples, Michael VIII Palaeologus died at this juncture (on 11 December, 1282). Michael had displayed military and diplomatic genius, but his restoration of the Byzantine empire had been very incomplete. It did not become a strong state, and the Latins in Greece and the Aegean profited from the

weakness of his successor Andronicus II, who immediately abandoned his father's policy of ecclesiastical union with Rome and made the intractable pro-Latin John Beccus step down from the patriarchal throne.¹⁴

The years were also to show that Michael VIII had probably failed to assess the true danger to Byzantium, which lay not in the West but in the East. The grandiose schemes of Charles of Anjou diverted him from serious efforts to check the continuing expansion of the Turks in Anatolia. Undoubtedly the removal of the Byzantine capital from Nicaea to Constantinople after 1261 diminished Michael's interest in defending the Greeks of Asia Minor, who had prospered and felt secure under the Lascarids, and who widely regarded him as a usurper. Once Michael had regained Constantinople, however, he had to protect the city from Latin claims. To further this aim he had of course accepted church union at Lyon in 1274, which had also served to alienate the Greeks of Asia Minor.

The recovery of Constantinople revived the Byzantine dream of universal empire, and made mastery of the Aegean and the reconquest of Greece a categorical imperative. But a weak state centered in Constantinople could not at the same time hold Asia Minor, the old nursery of Byzantine manpower, and also crush the Ducae of Epirus and Neopatras as well as the Latin dynasts. While Michael attacked the Greeks in Thessaly and Epirus, the Angevin forces in Albania, and the Latins in the Morea, Negroponte, and the Aegean islands, the Turks were overrunning the Byzantine territories in Asia Minor.¹⁵ When under the first Ottoman rulers

¹⁴ John Beccus was also forced to subscribe to an anti-Latin profession of faith, the text of which is given by George of Cyprus (Beccus's opponent and successor) in his *Exposition of the "Tome" of Faith against Beccus* (*Ἐκθεσις τοῦ τόμου τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τοῦ Βέκκου*), in PG 142, cols. 237–38, on which note George Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, I, 8–11, 14, 34–35 (Bonn, II, 25–36, 42–43, 89–103); J. D. Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIV (1780, repr. 1903), cols. 596–608; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzantina*, VI, 1, 2 and 5 (Bonn, I, 160, 163); Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1284, nos. 44 ff., vol. XXII (1870), pp. 544 ff.; and V. Grumel, "Le II^e Concile de Lyon et la réunion de l'église grecque," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, IX-1 (Paris, 1926), cols. 1403–9. On Byzantium after Michael VIII's death, see in general Angeliki E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328*, Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

¹⁵ On the growing strength of the Turks and their territorial expansion during the reign of Michael VIII, see Pachymeres, *De Michael Palaeologo*, III, 21, and IV, 27 (Bonn,

¹³ Cf. Hans E. Rohde, *Der Kampf um Sizilien in den Jahren 1291–1302*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1913 (in the *Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte*, Heft 42).

the Turks finally acquired effective leadership, Michael's successors on the throne would have little difficulty in identifying the Turkish advance as the chief danger to Byzantium.

Charles of Anjou died at Foggia on 7 January, 1285, and less than three months later (on 28 March) death forced Martin IV to give up the resources of the papacy which he had employed so generously on Charles's behalf. Jacopo Savelli, cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmidin, an old man and a sick one, was elected his successor on 2 April. He was crowned as Honorius IV on 20 May, and he lost no time in granting Charles of Anjou's son, Charles II the Lame, "the tithes of all churches for three years . . . for the recovery of Sicily from the power and dominion . . . of Pedro of Aragon, who held it contrary to the determination of the church."¹⁶ The historical stage was soon cleared of the figures who had played prominent roles in the great drama which culminated in the Sicilian Vespers. Philip III's "crusade" against Aragon-Catalonia failed in the summer of 1285, and Philip himself died on 5 October during the retreat from Spain.¹⁷ A month later Pedro III followed him to the grave (on 11 November). Meanwhile, the envoys of the Venetian doge Giovanni Dandolo had already negotiated with the government of Andronicus II Palaeologus, Michael VIII's son and successor, a ten years' truce.

The pact provided that the truce might extend beyond the decade in question if it was so desired. In any event the pact was to end in or after the year 1295 only if one of the high contracting parties formally notified the other that it was withdrawing therefrom, and legally to do this an advance notice of six months was required. This *vera et pura treugua* was signed by Andronicus in Constantinople on 15 June (1285), and ratified by the doge on 28 July. The Byzantine government undertook not to attack or otherwise molest the Venetians in Crete, Modon, and Coron although the island of Negroponte

did remain a bone of contention between the two powers.

The Byzantine government expressed its willingness to admit both Marco II Sanudo and Bartolommeo I Ghisi, island dynasts and good Venetians, into the truce, provided they observed the important articles of non-aggression. The Byzantines also granted the Venetians part of their old quarter on the southern shore of the Golden Horn, from the Porta Drungarii to the Porta Perame, as well as certain properties and rights in Thessalonica and elsewhere in the empire. There was to be no expulsion of the Genoese, however, *sed erit securitas per imperium nostrum inter Venetos et Januenses*. The Venetians were assured of the safety of their persons and goods throughout the empire, and were conceded full rights to come and go, buy and sell, without let or hindrance, tax or toll. The Venetians might purchase and export a limited quantity of grain, and were allowed various other economic and legal privileges which we need not specify; the two powers would also exchange prisoners, who might be free to go more or less where they chose.

Piracy would not be tolerated. Disputes would be adjudicated without hasty recourse to arms. Byzantine merchants might trade in Venice, paying only the regular taxes prescribed by the state. The Venetians were not to aid or abet the enemies of Byzantium in any way—nor furnish transport to them, which was obviously a blow to whatever imperial hopes were still being nurtured at the Angevin court in Naples. Specific reference is also made to the *pagani*, Turks, among the Byzantine enemies whom the Venetians would neither assist nor make a pact with. Finally the Byzantines promised to pay the Venetian government 24,000 *hyperperi* as reparations for the seizure of certain Venetian ships and other goods during the reign of Michael VIII as soon as the doge ratified the terms of the present treaty. The Byzantines would press no similar claims upon Venice (and probably had few to press). The text of the agreement was prepared by Ogerius (Ogier), *familiaris notarius* in the Byzantine chancery, and was sealed with a pendant golden bull on Friday, 15 June, 1285, in the palace of Blachernae in the presence of some of the highest dignitaries of the empire.¹⁸

I, 219–20, 310–12). Michael of course made some effort against the Turks (H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, Paris, 1966, pp. 372–73).

¹⁶ Salimbene, *Cronica*, in *MGH, SS.*, XXXII, 594, who had a very poor opinion of Honorius IV (*ibid.*, pp. 618–19, 629). On the pope's Sicilian policy, which continued that of Martin IV, see Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1285, nos. 16 ff., vol. XXII (1870), pp. 553 ff., and Cadier, *Essai sur l'administration du royaume de Sicile*, pp. 122 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Joseph R. Strayer, "The Crusade against Aragon," *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 102–13.

¹⁸ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, III (Vienna, 1857, repr. Amsterdam, 1964), no. CCCLXXVIII, pp. 322–39.

Thereafter in Venice the doge, Giovanni Dandolo, signed the agreement with his own hand on Saturday, 28 July, affirming the love and true affection which the Venetians had entertained of old for the Byzantine empire. Dandolo observed that, before the text of June, 1285, was decided upon, several embassies, three of them in fact, had been exchanged between Venice and Constantinople (*diversis factis ambaxatis ex utraque parte*). The pact was modeled upon previous agreements, so that a fuller understanding existed between the signatories than might otherwise have been the case. Since the proposal to make peace with the Byzantines, and thus abandon their alliance with Charles of Anjou, was apparently first broached in the Grand Council on 16 September, 1283, the Venetians had returned to their erstwhile love for Byzantium about a year after Pedro III's landing in Sicily, by which time it was clear that the Angevins could not break the Catalan hold upon the island.¹⁹

¹⁹ The doge's confirmation of the truce with Andronicus II is given in Tafel and Thomas, III, 339–53. The successful third Venetian mission to the imperial court was conducted by Angelo Marcello and Marco Zeno (*ibid.*, III, 323, 324, 340). The course of almost two years' negotiations can be followed in Roberto Cessi, ed., *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*, III (Bologna, 1934), entries from the Liber Luna. In April, 1283, Venetian merchants were not to go into the "lands of Palaeologus" (Luna, no. 35, p. 25). A month later the Grand Council declined the requests of an Angevin embassy for assistance (*ibid.*, nos. 45–46, p. 27), stating that it was the Venetian intention "attendere et facere illud quod nos debemus et ratio vult in isto facto" (no. 51, p. 28). On 8 August the Grand Council authorized the bailie and councillors of Negroponte to borrow 5,000 *hyperpyra* "for the purpose of defending the city and island of Negroponte, if it should be necessary, against the army of the Greek emperor" (no. 116, p. 41).

When on 16 September, however, a proposal was submitted to the Grand Council to make a "compositio seu treugua cum Imperatore Andronico," the vote was almost overwhelmingly in the affirmative: "capta fuit pars quod sic, et fuerunt CLXVI de sic, XL de non, XXXVIII non sinceri" (*ibid.*, no. 157, p. 49). Incidentally, in Venetian voting procedures *bale non sincere* were not "abstentions," but doubtful votes, which were often important, though not in the present instance. On 18 September the Grand Council agreed to send two envoys to Constantinople to negotiate a truce of "from seven to ten years" (nos. 160, 163–64) which was, if possible, to include the island of Negroponte (no. 165). The Venetian envoys were told not to allow the Greeks to prolong the negotiations beyond two months; each of the envoys received £400 from the state "as salary for the journey and expenses" (nos. 167, 170, p. 50). As of March, 1284, Venetian merchants were still not to go "ad terras Paleologi" (*ibid.*, no. 7, p. 62), and the same prohibition was still in effect on 17 June when Byzantine ambassadors informed the Venetian government that the Republic's

claims for reparations, which seem to have ranged from about 67,000 to 100,000 *hyperpyra*, were unacceptable to Andronicus II. The Grand Council therefore decided, again by an overwhelming vote, to send another envoy or envoys to the Bosphorus with the same full powers to negotiate as the first envoys, Andrea Zeno and Marino Morosini, had possessed (no. 53, p. 69). On 20 June orders were issued to arm a galley to convey the Republic's new envoys to the imperial court; it was suggested that Andronicus's ambassadors could return home with them. The Grand Council now wanted to see not only Negroponte but also the Athenian duchy included in the truce (nos. 59–61, pp. 70–71).

Two merchants, Luca Michiel and Marco Bobizo, were given permission (on 8 July, 1284) to accompany the envoys at the expense of the state, to plead their own case and that of others, "and if they get back what they lost, when they were captured with their ships, they can invest it in grain or in other things to bring back with them, but not in merchandise from the Levant. . . ." Michiel and Bobizo were forbidden to take money with them; they were not going for commercial purposes. They were also to take oaths "that they will tell the truth, according to their own good conscience, about what was in the ships when they were captured. . . ." (no. 76, p. 73, and cf. nos. 88, 177, pp. 75, 90). The Republic's envoys received the usual instructions and authorization to contract loans in an emergency (nos. 77, 89, pp. 73, 75), and the Byzantine ambassadors received the usual gifts as they prepared for their departure (no. 85, p. 74).

The Venetian envoys made some progress, because on 15 February, 1285, a Byzantine embassy was back in Venice. Andronicus's ambassadors, however, informed the doge that the imperial government would not subscribe to the truce at the cost of 66,600 *hyperpyra*, let alone 100,000: Andronicus's own evaluation of the Venetian losses was 24,000 *hyperpyra* (*ibid.*, no. 214, p. 96, and no. 17, p. 98). On 10 March the Grand Council voted to send a third mission to Constantinople (no. 9, p. 98), and on the thirteenth they agreed to a settlement for the 24,000 *hyperpyra* that Andronicus was willing to pay, although the Venetian envoys should get more if they could (no. 17, p. 98). The merchant Luca Michiel was allowed to return with the new envoys, Angelo Marcello and Marco Zeno. Another merchant, Bracco Bredani, who had suffered losses at the hands of the Greeks (no. 17, p. 98), was also granted permission to accompany Marcello and Zeno to Andronicus's court (nos. 25–28, 30, 33, pp. 100–1). Venetian traders were still forbidden to go into the "lands of Palaeologus" (no. 48, p. 103), and on 3 July, not knowing of the emperor's acceptance of the truce (on 15 June), the Grand Council was still making provision "pro defensione insule Nigropontis contra exercitum Imperatoris Grechorum" (no. 98, p. 113). As late as 7 July the Grand Council was prepared for a Venetian fleet of ten galleys to make war on the Byzantines if the truce was not signed (no. 103, p. 113).

Marcello and Zeno must have returned, with the truce agreed upon, within the next ten days or so, because on 22 July the text was read in the Grand Council and accepted (*ibid.*, no. 115, p. 115, and cf. no. 120, p. 116). On the twenty-eighth it received ceremonial confirmation by the doge (no. 122), and on the following day the Grand Council declared it legal to go "ad mercatum in Romaniam et ad terras Imperatoris et ad Mare Maius" (no. 123). A bailie and two councillors were to be elected and sent to Constantinople (nos. 124, 128–33, pp. 116–17, dated 29 July to 4 August, 1285). The Byzantine government paid

The statesmen of the Republic had read aright the changing temper of the times. Strict limits had been set to Angevin power, and Charles's successors would be confined within them. Furthermore, the Angevin alliance had not enhanced the prestige of the Holy See. By preaching crusades against Frederick II, Manfred, and Pedro III, the popes had spent some of the moral force of their appeal to arms for the alleged well-being of Christendom, and had weakened their own position of leadership in the *respublica Christiana*. Even before the disaster of the French "crusade" against Aragon-Catalonia, the Venetians had perceived the failure of Martin IV's policy against Byzantium and the house of Barcelona. The close connection was now broken between the French court and the Curia Romana. Louis IX and Philip III had died in crusading failures, but Philip the Fair had no intention of maintaining this pious tradition, and averted his eyes from the Mediterranean to fasten them upon the expansion of royal power in France. More than one pope had reminded more than one Capetian that the Crusade was a peculiarly French responsibility. Although in years to come more than one French king would announce his intention of going on a crusade, the fact is that after Philip III no French king was ever to do so.

Philip IV altered the focus of French royal ambition, and as far as the Crusade was concerned the year 1285 brought the thirteenth century to a close. "Thus 1285 marks . . . the end of the crusade as a regular and reliable instrument of papal policy," as J. R. Strayer has stated: "Deprived of the steady support of the French king, the pope was in a poor position to combat the rising tide of secularism and indifference."²⁰ Nevertheless, as we have already noted, the Crusade remained the only means the

papacy ever found of dealing with non-Christian enemies in the East and sometimes with Christian enemies in the West.

Popular interest and papal confidence in the Crusade did not perish, then, as a result of the failures of the later thirteenth century. All through the fourteenth century popes, princes, and publicists talked about the Crusade, and indeed launched some very important expeditions which, unfortunately from the Christian point of view, achieved little or nothing, while the Turkish peril increased quite without abatement from one decade to the next.

Whenever one appears to find a dearth of interest or action on the eastern fronts, it is always possible to turn to the *Annales ecclesiastici* of Raynaldus [Odorico Rinaldi, 1595-1671], who culled from the Vatican Archives important documents illustrating papal concern for eastern affairs for almost every year. For the last two decades of the thirteenth century we do not propose to follow either Raynaldus or his modern successors. But notice should be taken during these years of the efforts expended by at least one Mongol il-khan of Persia to form an alliance with the papacy, France, and England against the Seljuk Turks in Asia Minor and the Mamluks in Egypt. In the first year of his reign, for example, the Il-Khan Arghun (1284-1291) apparently sent an embassy with a conciliatory letter to Pope Honorius IV,²¹ and two years later dispatched Rabban Sauma, a relic-loving Nestorian monk from northern China,²² on an extraordinary mission to Honorius in Rome, Philip IV in Paris, and Edward I at Bordeaux in Gascony.

Rabban Sauma and the members of his mission left Persia in March, 1287, reached Constantinople in April, were in Naples by mid-June,

the indemnity of 24,000 *hyperpyra* before 5 December, 1286, on which day the Grand Council passed a resolution to the effect "that ducats should be minted from the 24,000 *yperperi*, which have recently come from Constantinople, for the benefit of those to whom they belong, so that our commune gains nothing therefrom and loses nothing" (Liber Zaneta, *ibid.*, no. 147, pp. 160-61). Although peace had thus been restored between Byzantium and Venice, it would only last the decade provided for in the truce. Brief summaries of some of the more important documents may be found in Freddy Thiriet, *Délibérations des assemblées vénitiennes concernant la Romanie*, I (Paris and The Hague, 1966), nos. LXVI ff., pp. 43-51, and no. CXIV, p. 53, and see the general discussion in A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 57-67.

²⁰ Strayer, "Crusade against Aragon," *Speculum*, XXVIII, 102-3.

²¹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1285, no. 79, vol. XXII (1870), pp. 573-74, the letter to the pope being dated on 18 May, 1285 (in Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 44, fol. 128); J. B. Chabot, "Notes sur les relations du roi Argoun avec l'Occident," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, II (1894), 568-74; Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, II (Quaracchi, 1913), 432-33; A. C. Moule, *Christians in China before the Year 1550*, London, 1930, pp. 105-7. The pope was much interested in organizing a crusade (Bernard Pawlicki, *Papst Honorius IV.*, Münster, 1896). See in general the brief but instructive article of Jean Richard, "The Mongols and the Franks," *Journal of Asian History*, III (Wiesbaden, 1969), 45-57.

²² Rabban Sauma was of Turkic origin (Paul Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, Paris, 1949, pp. 45-46).

and spent the month of July in Rome. Some time after their arrival in Naples they learned of Honorius IV's death (on 3 April, 1287), but in Rome the pious Rabban Sauma was received more than once by members of the Sacred College, before whom he made a profession of faith. Even if he could not discharge his embassy to the pope, *sede vacante*, at least he and his companions enjoyed their reverent visits to S. Pietro, the Lateran, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Paolo fuori le Mura, and indeed to "all the churches and convents in the great city of Rome." Rabban Sauma then went north into Tuscany, passed through Genoa in early August, reached Paris in early September (1287), and was in Gascony late the following month. According to the *Histoire de Mar Jabalaha*, Sauma was received both by Philip IV and Edward I, which was doubtless the case. His warm friendliness and appreciative curiosity seem to have gained him a willing reception wherever he went. The Mongol envoys marveled at the University of Paris with its 30,000 students, and admired the tombs of the French kings in the abbey Church of S. Denis, of which the choir and chevet had been finished only a half-dozen years before.

After the election of our old friend Jerome of Ascoli as Pope Nicholas IV (on 15 February, 1288), Rabban Sauma returned to Rome, having spent the winter in Genoa. As the fall of Acre drew near, papal activity in defense of the Holy Land had given way before the efforts of Angevin supporters in the Curia Romana to win back for Charles II of Anjou-Naples the controverted island of Sicily.²³ But Rabban Sauma certainly kindled the new pope's interest in the East. Nicholas IV was the first Franciscan pope and a former general of the Order. He received Sauma with great cordiality, and presumably

asked him about the imperiled Minorite convents in the Holy Land.

In any event Sauma was allowed to celebrate mass, apparently in the pope's presence, and watched with wide-eyed fascination the ceremonies of Holy Week, which led from day to day to the final Easter services in S. Maria Maggiore and the Church of the Lateran. Now that Rabban Sauma had discharged his appointed tasks, and delivered to the pope the gifts and letters of the Il-Khan Arghun as well as the offerings and letters of the Nestorian Catholicus Mar Jabalaha, he had to think of the long journey back to Persia. Sometime after Easter (28 March, 1288), Sauma asked for the papal permission to leave Rome. He had spent about six weeks in the city during this, his second, sojourn; he departed for Persia in mid-April,²⁴ with some months of good weather for travel lying pleasantly in prospect. Arghun and Mar Jabalaha both received him honorably, as well they might, and for the remainder of his days Rabban Sauma doubtless found among his Nestorian brethren eager listeners to his wondrous tales of the marvels of Rome.²⁵

²⁴ Cf. Nicholas IV's letters to Arghun, Mar Jabalaha, and others, dated in April, 1288 (Langlois, *Registres de Nicolas IV*, nos. 571-72, 575-78, 581, and cf. nos. 2218 ff.; Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, V [3rd ed., Quaracchi, 1931], 188-93, and cf. pp. 216 ff.; and Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1288, nos. 32-38, vol. XXIII [1871], pp. 38-40). On Arghun's two later embassies in 1289-1290 to Rome, Paris, and London, cf. Moule, *Christians in China before the year 1550*, pp. 117-19, and note Raynaldus, ad ann. 1289, nos. 60-64, vol. XXIII, pp. 64-66.

²⁵ J. B. Chabot, "Histoire du patriarche Mar Jabalaha III et du moine Rabban Sauma" [traduite du syriaque], *Revue de l'Orient latin*, I (1893, repr. 1964), 567-610, and, *ibid.*, vol. II (1894), 73-142 (and esp. pp. 87-121 for Rabban Sauma's embassies to Rome, Paris, and Gascony), 235-304 (with a chronology of events on pp. 301-4), and 566-643. Bar Hebraeus knows of Rabban Sauma's embassy to Rome on behalf of the Il-Khan Arghun (*The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj . . . Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus*, trans. from the Syriac by E. A. Wallis Budge, I [Oxford and London, 1932], 492). See also Golubovich, *Bibl. bibliogr.*, II (1913), 434-37, and for the letters which Rabban Sauma took back with him to Persia, together with other (later) papal letters to eastern prelates and potentates (dated in July, 1289), *ibid.*, II, 438-42, and esp. Chabot, "Notes," in *ROL*, II (1894), 576-600. The continuator of Florence of Worcester notes that Edward I received the Mongol envoys at Bordeaux before Christmas of 1287 (*Chron.*, ed. Benj. Thorpe, II [London, 1849], 239, and Chabot, *ROL*, IV [1896], 417). Cf. in general Denis Sinor, "Les Relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III (1956), 54-57. The Il-Khan Arghun sent a third embassy to the West in 1289-1290, a fourth in 1290-1291, and others followed in later years (see Chabot, *ROL*, II, 592 ff., 616 ff., and esp. Antoine Mostaert

²³ There can be little doubt that until the late summer of 1291 Nicholas IV gave more attention to the *subsidiū regni Siciliae* (Ernest Langlois, ed., *Les Registres de Nicolas IV*, 2 vols., Paris, 1905, I, nos. 96-105, 107-9, 560-61, 597, 613, 615, 617-18, 991-1009, 1136, 1178-80, 1227, 1354-55, 1882-83, 2114, 2170-71, 2178, 2181-85, 2245 ff., etc., 3261-64, and vol. II, nos. 4306-7, 4404, 6702-3, 6724, 6731, etc.) than to the *defensio Terrae Sanctae* (*ibid.*, I, nos. 620-22, 649, 679, 1357 [on the defense of Acre], 1585, 1906, 1934, 2056-57, 2252-60, 2265-70 [on preaching the crusade and the dispatch of galleys to Acre], 2516-18, 2772, 3676-78, and vol. II, nos. 4300-02, 4385-4403, 4409-14, 5319, 6664-6701, 6778-92, etc., etc.). From about August, 1291, the Curia gave more attention to the Holy Land, but Nicholas had certainly evinced much sympathy for the plight of eastern Christians and made appeals on their behalf (Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1289-1290, vol. XXIII [Bar-le-Duc, 1871], pp. 66-76).

During these years there were few wondrous tales to be told of the Morea, although conditions in the principality did improve for a while. When Charles of Anjou died in early January, 1285, his son and successor Charles II the Lame had hardly begun his more than four years' imprisonment in Sicily and Catalonia, having been captured on 5 June, 1284, when his squadron was defeated in the bay of Naples. Now on 10 July, 1289, shortly after his return to Italy, Charles granted his widowed sister-in-law Isabelle of Villehardouin, the late Prince William's daughter, the barony of Karytaina as well as the castle of Bucelet (Araklovon).²⁶ This was only

and F. W. Cleaves, *Les Lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhans Aryun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel*, Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

English translations of the remarkable Syriac history which details the western travels of Rabban Sauma may be found in Norman McLean, "An Eastern Embassy to Europe in the Years 1287-88," *English Historical Review*, XIV (1899), 299-312; James A. Montgomery, trans., *The History of Yaballaha III, Nestorian Patriarch, and of his Vicar Bar Sauma, Mongol Ambassador to the Frankish Courts at the End of the Thirteenth Century*, New York, 1927, introd. and pp. 51-73 (Columbia Univ. Records of Civilization), which contains the account of Rabban Sauma and gives about one-half of the whole chronicle; and E. A. Wallis Budge, trans., *The Monks of Kúblai Khân, Emperor of China: or The History of the Life and Travels of Rabban Sâumâ, Envoy and Plenipotentiary of the Mongol Khâns to the Kings of Europe . . .*, London, 1928, introd., pp. 63-71, and pp. 165-97, which provides a translation of the entire Syriac text, the page references relating to the travels of Rabban Sauma. On the historical importance of Rabban Sauma's mission to Rome, Paris, and Bordeaux, note also the learned study of [Cardinal] Eugène Tisserant, "L'Eglise nestorienne: Relations avec Rome," in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XI (Paris, 1931), esp. cols. 221 ff.; Giovanni Soranzo, *Il Papato, l'Europa cristiana e i Tartari*, Milan, 1930, pp. 260-71, and cf. pp. 281 ff.; Moule, *Christians in China before the Year 1550*, pp. 94-127; and B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1955, pp. 229-30 with refs., and cf. pp. 233, 457.

On the significance of Rabban Sauma's profession of faith in Rome, note Jean Richard, "La Mission en Europe de Rabban Sauma et l'union des églises," *Convegno di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* [1956]: *Oriente ed Occidente nel medio evo*, Rome, 1957, pp. 162-67 (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Atti dei convegni, 12), and for a strange association of Sauma with Bishop Leoterio of Veroli and his cathedral church, see M.-H. Laurent, "Rabban Saumâ, ambassadeur de l'Il-Khan Argoun, et la cathédrale de Veroli," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXX (1958), 331-65. An example of Sauma's seal in red wax is still extant (in the Vatican), and is described by Laurent, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-40, and plate I, no. 1. It was during his second sojourn in Rome (March-April, 1288) that Rabban Sauma added his name and seal, with those of thirteen other archbishops and bishops, to an indulgence for such *fideles Christi* as would give alms to assist in the construction or maintenance of the cathedral of S. Andrea in Veroli.

²⁶ Charles Perrat and Jean Longnon, eds., *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée (1289-1300)*, Paris, 1967, doc. 1, p. 21. Hugh, count of Brienne and Lecce, then held

the beginning of his "restitution and concession" of the Villehardouin inheritance, for by an order dated at Naples on 13 September (1289) Charles made provision for Isabelle's passage as *principissa Achaye* from Brindisi into the Morea.²⁷ A few days later she married Florent of Hainaut, a great-grandson of the Latin Emperor Baldwin I; a younger son (and no longer so young), Florent had come to Italy to seek his fortune amid the struggles of Anjou and Aragon. In a royal order of 26 September, Charles II recalled how the Villehardouin inheritance had passed to the royal house of Anjou (in 1278) as a result of the treaty of Viterbo (in 1267), and noted that he had granted Isabelle and her legitimate heirs the Moreote principality as an act "of sheer generosity and special grace." She was to hold it as an immediate vassal of the Angevin crown, and since she and her new husband would soon be leaving for Greece, Charles directed that two royal commissioners accompany them to see that they were formally installed in the principality and that the barons and feudatories of Achaea rendered due homage to them "according to the use and custom of the empire of Romania," provided they never departed themselves from the fealty they owed the house of Anjou.²⁸

Karytaina and Bucelet, having married Isabelle de la Roche, widow of Geoffrey of Briell, lord of Karytaina; as compensation for his loss Charles II gave Hugh the castellany of Beauvoir (Pontikocastro), a harbor fortress on the Ionian Sea (*ibid.*, docs. 2-3, pp. 22-23, dated 10 and 16 July, 1289). On 16 September Charles II confirmed an exchange of fiefs between Hugh de Brienne and Jean Chauderon, constable of Achaea, whereby Hugh acquired Conversano in the region of Bari in southern Italy (which Chauderon had received from Charles I), and in return the constable got the seaside castle of Beauvoir, said to have been worth 150 ounces of gold a year (*ibid.*, doc. 6, pp. 25-26).

On the capture of Charles the Lame by the admiral Roger de Lluria in a naval battle in the bay of Naples on 5 June, 1284, note J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, ed., *Chronicon Placentinum et Chronicon de rebus in Italia gestis*, Paris, 1856, p. 385. On 29 May, 1285, King Pedro III ordered Charles to be sent to Catalonia (Giuseppe La Mantia, ed., *Codice diplomatico dei re aragonesi di Sicilia . . .*, I [Palermo, 1917], doc. LXXVIII, pp. 162-64), which was done in November (*ibid.*, pp. 165, 354-55, and cf. docs. XCVII, CXLVII, CLV, CLIX ff.). Charles was freed after the treaty of Campofranco (in the Pyrenees), which was signed on 27 October, 1288 (cf. docs. CLXXIX, CLXXXI, CXC ff., with La Mantia's notes), and he was back in Italy in May, 1289.

²⁷ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 5, pp. 24-25.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, docs. 7-8, pp. 26-29, dated at Rieti on 26 September and at Naples on 3 October, 1289. Charles II noted that Isabelle "investita per nos de principatu ipso per coronam auream . . . prestito prius ut moris est fidelitatis solite juramento, ligium homagium exinde in manibus [nostris fec]it . . ." (*ibid.*, doc. 7, p. 27). One took an oath of fealty and rendered an act of homage. On Isabelle of

The rule of Florent of Hainaut (1289–1297) was wise, and his administration for the most part just and humane, although he was unduly partial to his relatives, some of whom unfortunately joined him in the Morea. The principality had lost much of its erstwhile importance by Florent's time, but we should run through some salient facts of its history, for we shall occasionally need them as a frame of reference. Throughout his entire regime Florent had some difficulties of feudal protocol with the duchess of Athens, Helena Ducaena, guardian and mother of the young Guy II de la Roche, from whom he demanded fealty and homage, although the duchess rejected his claims to suzerainty, as we shall see in a later chapter. But for the most part Florent seems to have been easy to get along with; he made peace with the Byzantine captain (κεφαλῆ) of Mistra, and refused to allow minor incidents to lead to war. Security of life and property brought back a measure of economic well-being to the Morea, and Florent's death at Andravida in 1297 was regretted by Latins and Greeks alike.²⁹

For some time after the death of Charles of Anjou papal interest in overseas affairs was diverted from the Levant. Under Andronicus II the Byzantines were hardly dangerous, and there were too many problems in Sicily, France, Aragon, and elsewhere in the West. Officials of the Curia Romana cast their eyes eastward, to be sure, during the destructive decade in which Venice was engaged in her second indecisive war with Genoa (1293/4–1299). The latter's unfortunate ally Andronicus II was also drawn into the futile contest (1296–1302), only to be

abandoned to his own inadequate resources when the Genoese made peace with Venice. The struggle reduced the substance of both republics; it contributed to civil strife in Genoa, and strengthened the nobility's hold upon Venice. The Turks resumed their offensive in Asia Minor. As war filled the Aegean and the Adriatic, the Curia lost its grasp upon the churches in Greece. Uncertainty attends the dates of tenure and even the names of the archbishops of Athens, Thebes, and Corinth. The capitular canons were obviously electing their own bishops and archbishops, who sought confirmation from their fellows in Greece and from the Latin patriarch, who was usually anxious to preserve as much independence of the Curia Romana as he could. Very often the Curia was not informed of these elections. Papal documents, as recorded in Eubel, list one appointment made to the archiepiscopal see of Thebes between 1252 and 1308, and none from 1253 until 1330 to that of Naxos and Paros, whose archbishop presided over the Cyclades.³⁰

There are, as usual, rhetorical letters providing for the collection of crusading tithes and subsidies, purportedly for the recovery of the Holy Land (the *negotium Terrae Sanctae*), grants of indulgences for crusaders, and excommunications of those who trafficked in arms with the Moslems. But during Boniface VIII's reign (1294–1303) we learn few specific facts relating to the Latin Church in Greece—a few appointments, a scandal, and the building of a monastery. Thus in October, 1295, Boniface VIII nominated John, dean of the Church of Patras, as archbishop of the see, and then allowed him to borrow 2,500 gold florins for his own needs and those of his church.³¹ He

Villehardouin's marriage to Florent of Hainaut and their occupation of the principality of Achaea, note the Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, vv. 8483–8652, pp. 550–60, and the French *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, pars. 589–96, pp. 236–39: When Florent went into the Morea, "si trova le pays en moult grant povreté, tout gasté et exilié par le mauvais gouvernement des officiaux qui souffrirent a faire grans tors a la povre gent, especialement aux hommes de la court."

²⁹ Cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, Paris, 1949, pp. 264–78, and on the efforts of Isabelle and Florent of Hainaut to secure recognition of the suzerainty they claimed over the duchy of Athens, see below, Chapter 16. For a general sketch of Moreote history from the Fourth Crusade to 1460, see the chapter by Jean Longnon and especially those by Peter Topping, in K. M. Setton, R. W. Wolff, and H. W. Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, II (2nd ed., 1969), 235–74, and III (1975), 104–66. D. A. Zakythinos' notable work on *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, 2 vols., Paris and Athens, 1932–53, has been republished, with additions and corrections by Dr. Chryssa A. Maltezou (London: Variorum, 1975).

³⁰ C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 482, 358. On the first two wars between Venice and Genoa (1256–1269/70, 1293/94–1299), see Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920, repr. Aalen, 1964), 59–67, and on the sources, *ibid.*, p. 574. The first war is described at some length in W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, I (1885, repr. 1967), 344–54, and the second in Heyd, I, 445–48, and A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 101–14. There is a sketch of Venetian, Genoese, Angevin, Byzantine, and Catalan-Sicilian diplomatic moves in 1301–1302 in Paolo Sambin, "La Politica mediterranea di Venezia alla fine della guerra del Vespro," in the *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, CIV-2 (Venice, 1944–45), 971–98, with an account of the Veneto-Byzantine war, *ibid.*, 978–86.

³¹ Georges Digard, Antoine Thomas, et al., eds., *Les Registres de Boniface VIII*, I (1884–1907), nos. 426, 471, 492; Eubel, I, 393. A certain Leonard, archdeacon of Patras, was appointed bishop of Olena on 26 March, 1300

had the treasurer of the Church of Argos look into the matrimonial squabbles of a woman, clearly of some means, who first married a Spoletan in the diocese of Athens and then moved to Thebes, where she married a Venetian knight (*miles*), the majordomo of her household. Excommunicated by the archbishop of Athens, she appealed to the Latin Patriarch Peter of Constantinople, who relaxed the ban *contra iusticiam* without giving the first husband a chance to be heard. The Spoletan therefore appealed to Rome, because he could not (he said) secure justice in the Athenian duchy, where the lady and her Venetian lover were obviously too influential with the patriarch.³² How the case was finally adjudicated, is not clear. In November, 1300, Boniface granted a concession "to a certain monastery of the Order of S. Clara, of the diocese of Olena, built by Isabelle, princess of Achaea. . . ."³³ Such data need detain us no longer.

The Angevin documents recently published by Perrat and Longnon, however, provide a further glimpse into the affairs of Latin churchmen in Greece in the last decade of the thirteenth century. Thus on 13 May, 1292, Prince Charles Martel, acting on behalf of his father Charles II, who was then in Aix-en-Provence, wrote the "master of the passes" (*magister passuum*) in the Terra di Lavoro, directing him to return to one John de Fusolono the sum of 13 pounds, 20 denarii Venetian, and 40 silver solidi of Tours. John was the agent of Pietro Lupelli and Stefano Lupelli, canons of Corinth and Athens respectively and both chaplains of the powerful Cardinal Benedetto Caetani, who was to become Pope Boniface VIII in less than three years. The money came "from the revenues of the prebends which the chaplains hold there" (in Greece), and John had ventured with it into the south Italian kingdom in ignorance of a royal order prohibiting the export of precious metal. The master of the passes had seized the money, believing it was being illegally taken

from the kingdom, and John had appealed to the prince in Naples. The Lupelli apparently appealed to Cardinal Benedetto, who intervened strenuously on his chaplains' behalf, and an order went out immediately to the master of the passes to restore the full amount in question and to allow John freely to depart with it from the kingdom.³⁴

A royal mandate of 26 September, 1296, informed the lieutenant of the admiral of Sicily, that "commissioners of the venerable father in Christ, the lord L[andolfo Brancaccio], cardinal deacon of S. Angelo, appointed by him to collect money for the tithe in Achaea, have already collected about 500 ounces of gold. . . ." By whatever authority, Charles II proposed to use the tithes of Achaea in building ships then under construction in his dockyards.³⁵ On the other hand, he granted Romanus, bishop of Croia in Epirus, who had been driven from his see, an annual pension of four ounces of gold from the market and customs dues of Barletta.³⁶ It was not much with which to maintain an episcopal estate, but Charles was more generous with Lenzio (or Leuzio) Corasio, the bishop of Bitonto in southern Italy, who had served the royal family on some delicate missions in Greece. Lenzio received an annual pension of twenty ounces of gold, to be paid from the local tithe of oil which the crown collected each year.³⁷

Charles II lent a willing ear to the complaints of the clergy, and on 9 March, 1296, he requested his son Philip, prince of Taranto, to require his captain of Corfu to cease interfering with the archbishop's jurisdiction over his clergy, Greek as well as Latin. Also Philip's fiscal agents (*magistri massarii*) were not to cultivate church lands without permission of the archbishop and chapter of Corfu, and when they did sow such lands (always with permission), they were to pay the accustomed tithes, which they had been refusing to do. Certain vassals and dependents of Philip had taken over salt works, lands, and other possessions of the church, to the obvious loss of the

(*Registres*, II [1890–1904], no. 3520, col. 664; Eubel, I, 375), and another Leonard, from the Church of S. Bartolommeo near the Rialto in Venice, was named to the Latin patriarchate on 31 March, 1302 (*Registres*, III [1906–21], no. 4588, col. 428; Eubel, I, 206).

³² *Registres de Boniface VIII*, I, no. 516, cols. 180–81, dated 20 April, 1295. The Latin patriarch of Constantinople was probably residing at the time in Negroponte; on 1 July, 1296, Boniface exempted the bishop of Negroponte from the patriarchal jurisdiction (*ibid.*, I, no. 1143, col. 408).

³³ *Ibid.*, II, no. 3783, col. 845.

³⁴ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée* (1967), doc. 40, pp. 52–53.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, doc. 188, p. 162.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, doc. 97, p. 99, dated 5 July, 1294. Croia was a suffragan see of Durazzo (Eubel, I, 216).

³⁷ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 131, pp. 125–26, dated 18 January, 1295; Eubel, I, 142.

clergy, and Philip was to see that the captain dealt justly with this complaint.³⁸

When Boniface VIII condemned the Spiritual Franciscans, called Fraticelli or "Bisoci," some of them sought refuge in Greece, where a small group gathered on an island in the Gulf of Corinth, probably Trissonia, which was then under the domination of Thomas III d'Autremencourt of Salona.³⁹ On 11 January, 1300, Charles II informed Philip of Taranto's captain in Romania that the pope had ordered the Latin Patriarch Peter and the archbishops of Patras and Athens to seek out the Bisoci and punish them as well as any person or persons who assisted or received them. Charles directed the captain to see that no one under his jurisdiction offered the least obstacle to this pious pursuit of religious dissenters, and indeed, if the patriarch and the archbishops asked for his aid and counsel, the captain was to help them carry out the papal mandate.⁴⁰

The Angevin documents from the time of Florent of Hainaut provide a rich illustration of feudal politics and protocol, especially in the Achaean claim to suzerainty over Athens, to which we shall come subsequently. The texts abound in other oddments of information. Thus the only way to travel in the Morea in the thirteenth century (and indeed until the later nineteenth century) was on horseback or by mule. Such means of transport seem to have been in short supply, however, judging from the number of licenses which Charles II granted for the free export of horses and mules from Apulia into the Morea.⁴¹ Sometimes Charles gave permission to transport

grain, chiefly wheat and barley, from Apulia into the Morea and the Athenian duchy,⁴² and the documents also give us an occasional insight into the problems of merchants trading in Glarentza and elsewhere in the Morea.⁴³

When the spring of 1300 came, Princess Isabelle of Villehardouin appointed Nicholas III of S. Omer, lord of half Thebes, as her bailie in the Morea, for she intended to go to Rome to share in the spiritual benefits which Pope Boniface VIII had provided for pilgrims during the first jubilee. Isabelle and her suite sailed from Glarentza to Ancona aboard two Venetian galleys which were making the return voyage from Alexandria. From Ancona she made her way to Rome, where she probably had little trouble finding lodgings although the city was so full of pilgrims in search of grace, says the Moreote chronicler, "that it was a wonder to behold." Isabelle visited the holy places every day, "as the other pilgrims were doing," but she had had a further purpose in coming to Rome. She wished to meet Philip of Savoy, son of Thomas III, late count of Maurienne and Piedmont, and nephew of Amadeo V, count of Savoy. Isabelle and Philip had been in touch with each other through the mediation of Leonardo Patrasso and Luca Fieschi, both of whom became cardinals in Boniface VIII's fourth promotion of 2 March, 1300. Philip was twenty-two years of age, and Isabelle more than forty, but she wanted a male heir to whom to leave her rich inheritance, and she needed a strong husband to help her defend the principality. Philip was apparently the best prospect, and now she proposed to marry him without seeking the consent of King Charles II, as she was required to do by the terms under which he had ceded the principality to her in 1289.⁴⁴

Cardinal Leonardo Patrasso was a relative of the pope, who clearly favored the marriage. On 7 February, 1301, Isabelle gave Philip of Savoy the castle and castellany of Corinth with all their dependencies, and he undertook to re-

³⁸ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, docs. 167–68, pp. 149–51, and note docs. 186–87. The archbishop's name was Stephen; he does not appear in Eubel, I, 209. Stephen's successor was named Demetrius (*Actes*, doc. 213), also unknown to Eubel. Both Greeks and Latins found the administration of Philip of Taranto's officials highly unsatisfactory everywhere in Romania (*cf.*, *ibid.*, docs. 206–7, 213, 216). The *magistri massarii* (in Greek *μαστορομασσάροι*) are well-known officials in Angevin Corfu; they attended to financial and other affairs relating to the princely "estate" (*massa*).

³⁹ *Cf.* G. Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa*, I (1906), 347–49, and *cf.*, *ibid.*, vol. II (1913), 80–81, 97, 466 ff.

⁴⁰ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 230, pp. 197–98, and *cf.* doc. 231, to Isabelle, princess of Achaea, and Karl Hopf, in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, eds., *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), pp. 350–51 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 284–85).

⁴¹ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, docs. 58, 73, 77, 84–85, 98, 114, 132, 203, 209.

⁴² *Ibid.*, docs. 48, 115, 122, 157, 166, 193–95.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, docs. 53, 67, 94, 124. On agricultural conditions in the Morea, especially from the 1330's, see Jean Longnon and Peter Topping, *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1969, with a rich commentary.

⁴⁴ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 841–47, pp. 333–35; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 504–5, p. 111; Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 13; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 280–82.

conquer those parts of the old Villehardouin principality which had been lost to the Greeks. If sons were born of this marriage, the Corinthian grant would become a dead letter, for they would inherit the principality. The wedding took place in Rome on Sunday, 12 February, in the presence of Count Amadeo V of Savoy, Count Guy III of S. Pol, Pierre Flotte, a royal councillor of France, and other nobles and invited guests. The archbishop of Lyon, Henry de Villars, a papal chaplain, was also present. The menu and bill for the wedding feast are still extant, and bear witness to strong appetites, gaily decorated halls, the songs of minstrels, and generous gratuities, the costs amounting in all to 488 pounds, 17 solidi, and 9 denarii in the coinage of Vienne.⁴⁵

Isabelle's disregard of the Angevins' paramount rights in Achaea had provoked Charles II into ordering the preparation of a letter patent on 6 February, 1301, declaring that her marriage to Philip of Savoy had violated the "form and tenor of the conventions" (in the first treaty of Viterbo of 24 May, 1267) under which he had ceded the Morea to her. (Although the marriage did not take place until 12 February, the text assumes that Isabelle was already married.) Charles therefore declared the principality forfeit, and bestowed it as a fief upon his son Philip, prince of Taranto, to whom he had of course already granted the Moreote suzerainty. Charles had the document duly sealed, but events had been moving so rapidly that he withheld publication of it,⁴⁶ presumably owing to the insistence of Boniface VIII.

Papal pressure also led Charles II (with extreme reluctance) to accept Isabelle's marriage, and on 23 February (1301) Charles, being in Rome at the time, personally invested Philip of Savoy with the Moreote principality in

a ceremony at the Lateran. He made the investiture in the name of his son Philip of Taranto, suzerain of the principality, then a prisoner of the Catalans, who had defeated and captured him at the battle of Falconaria in western Sicily (on 1 December, 1299). At the time of Isabelle's marriage Charles had to deal gingerly with the irascible pontiff, on whom he largely depended to finance Angevin pretensions in Sicily. Boniface was disgusted with what he regarded as the general incompetence shown by the Angevins in their conduct of the never-ending war. An interesting report of some months later informs us "that the illustrious King Charles came to Anagni on the Saturday after the feast of the Assumption of the blessed Mary (i.e., on 19 August, 1301), and asked the pope for a subsidy, and finally after the pope had said many harsh, violent, and abusive words to him, a tithe was conceded and granted to him, without restriction for three years, in the whole of Italy, Sardinia, Corsica, Venice, Greece (to the extent the Church holds sway there), and in a certain part of Germany where they speak French."⁴⁷

As he took the papal abuse (and the tithe that went with it) Charles doubtless thought that the old man would not live forever, and as for the Morea, he kept on file his declaration of 6 February to the effect that Isabelle had forfeited the principality by her marriage. Philip of Savoy showed more ambition than integrity and more cupidity than capacity; he also failed to establish a satisfactory regime during the three years he spent in the principality (1301–1304). The French chronicler of the Morea thought Philip of Savoy had seen too much of "li thyrant de Lombardie,"⁴⁸ employing their peremptory ways in a feudal society which prized its liberties. His unsuccess made him the more vulnerable to the slings of Angevin policy, for as count of Piedmont he was also at odds in northern Italy with Charles II, who possessed the nearby counties of Provence and Forcalquier, and was anxious to extend his influence over the town of Asti and the margraviate of Montferrat. On 9 October, 1304, Charles revived his letter patent (of 6 February, 1301) asserting Isabelle's forfeiture of the principality and its cession to the prince of Taranto.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85, p. 351 (repr. I, 285), and "Journal de la dépense de l'hostel du prince Philippe de Savoye faite par clerc Guichard," in *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 231–35. Guy of S. Pol and Pierre Flotte had come to Italy as envoys of King Philip IV of France, who was at the time trying to allay the *discordia* between the Genoese on the one hand and the pope and Charles II on the other (H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I [1908], doc. 62, pp. 89–90, and cf. vol. III [1922], doc. 43, pp. 93–94). Isabelle is said to have married Philip of Savoy "par la volonté dou pape" (Longnon, *Chronique de Morée*, p. 401).

⁴⁶ J. A. C. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, II (Paris, 1845): Naples, doc. XXXIV, pp. 339–43.

⁴⁷ Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, doc. 71, p. 101, dated at Anagni on 14 September, 1301.

⁴⁸ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, par. 855, p. 338.

⁴⁹ Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II, 342–43.

Philip of Savoy left the Morea for northern Italy as early as November, 1304, and his affairs so prospered during the following year that the Angevins sought an understanding with him. But disagreement soon sprang from a persistent conflict of interests, and on 5 June, 1306, Charles deprived Philip of Savoy of the principality and released his Moreote vassals from the allegiance they had sworn to him. At length, on 11 May, 1307, Philip relinquished his unenforceable claims to the principality in return for certain concessions in Italy.⁵⁰ Philip of Taranto was now recognized as the prince of Achaëa (1307–1313). He made Duke Guy II de la Roche of Athens his bailie in the Morea, until the latter's death in 1308. This may have been done to appease Guy's feeling that his wife, Mahaut de Hainaut, had been cheated of her inheritance, for Mahaut, the daughter of Isabelle and Florent, also claimed the principality. Isabelle finished her life in exile, mostly in Hainaut, in the lands of her second husband. Her unhappy daughter Mahaut, who had two husbands after Guy's death, was to become the princess of Achaëa (1313–1318), but finally died in 1331 in prison at Aversa, a victim (like her mother) of Angevin intransigence.

With the Catalan conquest of the duchy of Athens in 1311, Angevin interests in the Morea had to be reconsidered by Clement V at Avignon, by Philip the Fair of France, and by Robert the Wise of Naples. In 1313 some complicated marriage alliances were effected, five of them in fact, touching Angevin interests both in Italy and in the Morea. Philip of Taranto became titular Latin emperor of Constantinople through his marriage with Catherine of Valois-Courtenay, the great-granddaughter of Baldwin II. Philip remained subject to his brother, Robert of Naples, but became the suzerain of the prince of Achaëa,

Louis of Burgundy (1313–1316), to whom the principality now passed by virtue of his marriage to Mahaut de Hainaut. Her interests were being watched over by Philip the Fair.

There were other claimants to the principality, however, for the indecisive and double-dealing policy of the amiable Charles II of Naples had helped produce these claims and counter-claims, some of which were only to be extinguished in blood. Isabelle's sister, Marguerite of Villehardouin, younger daughter of Prince William, passed on her own dubious claim to her daughter Isabelle de Sabran's husband, the brave Infante Ferdinand of Majorca, who took the title prince of Achaëa (1315–1316). He lost his life in Elis, after the battle of Manolada (on 5 July, 1316), trying to implement the claim of his wife, who had just died, and of their son James, against the forces of Mahaut and Louis of Burgundy.⁵¹ Before her death in 1331, however, Mahaut, who had suffered from Angevin ambition, named as her heir Ferdinand's son, the young James [II] of Majorca, whose father had been slain after his defeat by her husband. Finally, Isabelle of Villehardouin's third husband, Philip of Savoy, also renewed his claims to the principality, because of the failure of the Angevins to keep their promises to him, and his successors held the empty title until the last of them, Louis of Savoy-Achaëa, died in 1418. The dynastic history of the titular and actual rulers of the Latin states in Greece possesses much political importance, and is necessary for the understand-

⁵⁰ On the career of Philip of Savoy, see *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 848–71, 886–89, 919–72, 979–95, 1007–8, 1014, 1017, and pp. 401–2, and cf. *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 504–15; Friedrich Kunstmann, "Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren . . .," *Abhandlungen d. historischen Classe d. k. bayer. Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, VII (Munich, 1855), 775; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85, pp. 351b–55a, 362b–63a, 364a–65a, 366, 367, 368b (repr. I, 285 ff.); Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 195 ff.; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 282–83, 287–91, with indication of the sources. Hopf, *op. cit.*, pp. 365a, 366a, dates Philip of Savoy's return to Italy in November, 1305. Despite the record of 11 May, 1307, Philip did not give up the title Prince of Achaëa, which his descendants kept until 1418.

⁵¹ [Chas.] du Fresne Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople* [1657], ed. J.A.C. Buchon, 2 vols., Paris, 1826, II, 172–88, who bases his account largely upon a text allegedly dated 1344 (and in any event after 1324), called a *Declaratio summaria super facto de morte domini Infantis Ferrandi de Majorica* (*ibid.*, pp. 383–92), according to which Ferdinand was misled by his advisers, and killed after the battle of Manolada as he was retiring toward Chloulmoutsi. The so-called Aragonese *Chronicle of the Morea*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos*, Geneva, 1885, pars. 560–626, pp. 122–37, describes in some detail the prolonged contest for the principality of Achaëa as well as Ferdinand of Majorca's occupation of Glarentza (in early August, 1315, on which note Rubió i Lluch, in the work cited below, doc. no. XXXIV, pp. 360–61), Chloulmoutsi, Andravida, and Chalandritza, his defeat and death, and Louis of Burgundy's own death (on 2 August, 1316) shortly after his victory. See in general, however, Antoni Rubió i Lluch, "Contribució a la biografia de l'infant Ferràn de Mallorca," *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, VII (1913), 291–379, esp. pp. 308 ff., who publishes a number of important (largely new) documents relevant to the Moreote career of Ferdinand, esp. nos. XXIX ff., including the *Declaratio summaria* mentioned above (no. XL).

ing of many developments during this era of Greek history which would otherwise be unintelligible. It does not, to be sure, greatly increase our knowledge of conditions in Greece and the Aegean, and we shall try henceforth to make as little reference to it as we may find practicable.⁵²

Angevin promises and intrigue were not enough to defend the Morea against the growing power of the Greeks of Mistra, who occupied among others the important Arcadian castles of Matagrifon, near the modern Dimitziana, and of Karytaina, which looks down into the valley of the Alpheus. They also took the castle of S. George between Mistra and Nauplia late in the year 1320. During the summer and fall of 1321 King Robert the Wise of Naples, who was then residing in Avignon, was concerned with the recovery of lands lost to the Greeks and with the protection of those being attacked by the Catalans and Turks.⁵³ Of the

dozen baronies organized after the conquest only three now remained intact, the archiepiscopal barony of Patras, Chalandritza, and Vostitza. Most of the great families of the conquest had become extinct. The French declined in numbers and influence; Italians began to predominate; they came from the kingdom of Naples, Venice, Genoa, and Florence. But feudalism survived in "Romania," often in modified forms, vassals with small fiefs frequently becoming mere landholders, who commuted the erstwhile military service into money payments to their lords.

During the early period of this political and social disintegration in the Morea and very likely in consequence of it, as Jean Longnon has suggested, unknown wielders of the pen produced the original versions, no longer extant, of the *Assizes of Romania*, called the Book of the Usages and Statutes of the Empire of Romania, and of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, called the Book of the Conquest of the Principality of the Morea. The Assizes seem to have been, to start with, an unofficial codification of Moreote law, probably given much their present form between 1333 and 1346, and conceivably intended for the instruction of the Angevin court of Naples, which had been involved in the affairs of the peninsula for some sixty years, and whose high-handed sons and officials were in grave need of instruction in the feudal rights and usages which had obtained in the principality since the early years of the conquest.⁵⁴ In time, however, the Assizes

⁵² On the later Angevins, see É. G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples*, Paris, 1954, pp. 161 ff., 199 ff., 295 ff., who gives in this book, however, inadequate attention to eastern affairs. On Philip of Taranto, see Léonard, *La Jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}, reine de Naples, comtesse de Provence*, I (Monaco and Paris, 1932), 126–31, 136 ff., 145.

⁵³ See the detailed account in the Aragonese *Chronicle of the Morea*, ed. Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos*, pars. 641–54, pp. 140–43. According to the chronological table prefixed to the Brussels MS. of the French version of the *Chronicle of the Morea* (see below), on Tuesday, 9 September, 1320, the castellan of S. George treacherously surrendered the castle to Andronicus Palaeologus Asen (or Asan), the Byzantine governor of Mistra, who also seized Matagrifon, Polyphengos, Karytaina, "et autres chastiaux que li traytor qui les gardoient vendirent a celui Assaigni [Asen] par son decevement" (*Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon [1911], pp. 404–5). On Asen, note Averkius Th. Papadopoulos, *Versuch einer Genealogie der Palaiologen, 1259–1453*, Munich, 1938, repr. Amsterdam, 1962, no. 46, pp. 23–29; and on the historical background D. A. Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, I (Paris, 1932), 70–72; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 311; R. J. Loenertz, "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," in the *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II (*Studi e testi*, 232), Città del Vaticano, 1964, no. 5, pp. 403, 413–14; and cf. D. Jacoby, "Un Régime de Coseigneurie gréco-franque en Morée," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 1963, pp. 111–125. G. M. Monti, *Nuovi Studi angioini*, Trani, 1937, pp. 612 ff., publishes eight documents dated from 18 July to 10 November, 1321. Although of course the Greeks had occupied S. George, Matagrifon, and Karytaina, King Robert seemed to think on 18 July, 1321, that these three places had been taken by the Catalans (Monti, *op. cit.*, p. 626). The king was much aggrieved "quod gens Grecorum scismatica et societas Catalanorum nefanda ac Turchorum pleps [i.e. plebs] Saracenica Christiane fidei inimica non absque temerarie presumptionis audacia principatum nostrum Achae continuis aggressionibus impugnant hostiliter et tam personis quam rebus dampna multiplicia inferre non cessant" (Monti, p. 614, doc. dated 6 October,

and cf. pp. 617, 620, 621, 623, docs. dated 12 and 20 October). On 21 July he feared an attack upon the Moreote principality, of which he was suzerain, by the Byzantines (Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947, doc. CXIX, p. 147), and some three years thereafter, on 2 September, 1324, we find him seeking an alliance with the Venetians against both the Greeks and the "unspeakable Catalan Company" (*ibid.*, doc. CXXII, pp. 150–51). This was of course not Robert's first effort to enlist Venetian support, but in October (1324) the doge replied that the Republic could not ally itself with the Angevins against either the Greeks or the Catalans, for it possessed a peace both with the Byzantine emperor "and with those of the Company" (*ibid.*, doc. CXXIII, pp. 152–53).

⁵⁴ Cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 316–18, 325, and Monti, *Nuovi Studi angioini*, pp. 630–34. Although the account in the *Chronicle of the Morea* describing the settlement of Marguerite de Passavant's claim to the barony of Akova in Arcadia (*Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 501–31, pp. 197 ff., and *Chronicle of Morea* [Greek version], ed. Schmitt [1904], vv. 7301–7752, pp. 474 ff.) shows that a written *livre des usages* or *livre des loys* existed in Prince William's possession, presumably in 1276 (*Chron. de Morée*, pars. 519–24, pp. 205–7), on which see D. Jacoby, *La*

of Romania became the official law code of feudalized society in Venetian-held Negroponte and Nauplia, and from about the mid-fifteenth century also in Corfu, where the Venetians held continuous sway for more than four centuries (1386–1797), and where jurists sometimes consulted the Assizes until the Napoleonic occupation of the island brought Veneto-Corfiote feudalism to an end. A knowledge of the Assizes was indispensable to the Venetian castellans of Modon and Coron in the administration of their office although there was little feudalism in southern Messenia. The Assizes also determined dower rights, inheritance, transfers of property, and similar matters in the more or less independent duchy of Naxos, even into the Ottoman period (after 1566), as well as in the lordship of the Ghisi family at Tenos and Mykonos in the Cyclades. Local requirements gave rise to different practices, as, indeed, at Tenos and Mykonos, where the grant of a small fief, sometimes called a *pronia*, might entail service as a bowman on the island galley. Although Byzantine law long survived in various parts of Romania, the *pronia* of Tenos and Mykonos appears to have had little but the name in common with the Byzantine *pronoia*. Texts of the Assizes exist only in a dozen late Venetian manuscripts, ranging from the year 1423 to the mid-eighteenth century,⁵⁵ but recent research indicates that the original may well have been in French, the dominant language of the Moreote feudality until the later fourteenth century.⁵⁶

More than a word should be said about the so-called *Chronicles of the Morea*, the mirrors of Moreote civilization during the period of Frankish domination. The original, the so-called "prototype" of the Chronicles, has of course been lost for centuries, *vox et praeterea nil*, which has caused disagreement as to when and in

what language it was written, the nature of its contents, and how far down in time it covered the history of the Latin baronage in Greece. But after a fashion the original Chronicle survives in four later versions, in four languages and eight manuscripts, of which five are in popular Greek verse, and one each in French, Aragonese, and Italian prose.⁵⁷ The extant French and Greek Chronicles are clearly closest to the prototype, the disappearance of which

⁵⁷ The MSS. are well known and are all identified with shelf-mark numbers in the recent article by David Jacoby, "Quelques Considerations sur les versions de la 'Chronique de Morée,'" in the *Journal des Savants*, 1968, pp. 133–34, note 1; John Schmitt, *The Chronicle of Morea*, pp. xv–xviii, xxviii ff., who publishes on opposite pages both the Copenhagen and Paris MSS. (see below), and whose edition of the former MS. is reprinted in P. P. Kalonaros, *Tò Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*, Athens, 1940; Jean Longnon, *Livre de la conquête de la principauté de l'Amorée: Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)*, pp. xxi ff., lxxxv ff.

The unique MS. of the French Chronicle, of which Longnon, *op. cit.*, has prepared a careful edition, is to be found in Brussels in the Bibliothèque Royale, no. 15,702. It dates from the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century. The Greek Chronicle is extant in five MSS., of which the oldest is in Copenhagen (known as Havniensis 57, of the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century, it was formerly in the University Library and is now in the Royal Library in Copenhagen). Of much importance for filling certain lacunae in Havn. 57 is a MS. of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century in Paris (Bibl. Nationale, Paris. gr. 2898). There is a second "valueless" copy of the Greek Chronicle in Paris (Cod. gr. 2753), and others at Turin and Berne, for which see Schmitt, *op. cit.*, pp. xvii–xviii. There is only one MS. of the so-called Aragonese version, formerly in the library of the duke of Osuna and now in Madrid in the Biblioteca Nacional, MS. 10,131, which has been edited by Alfred Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, Geneva, 1885. This MS. is dated 1393. Finally Chas. Hopf found and published in his *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 414–68, the only known copy of a late Italian version (*Cronaca di Morea*), which is in Venice in the Bibl. Nazionale Marciana, MS. Ital. Cl. VII, no. 712 (8754), fols. 25^r–47^r, which depends upon the MS. in Turin (*cf.* Longnon, *Chronique*, p. lxxxiii). The first part of the MS. in the Marciana (fols. 1–25^r, bound in disorder), which is written in a clear, minute hand, contains the *Istoria di Romania composta per Marin Sanudo detto Torsello* (inc. "Il principato d'Achaia ebbe prima principe Ser Zuffredo;" expl. "Carlo di Valois tornar a Napoli or per mar or per terra, come li piacesse"), ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, pp. 99–170, who has made necessary corrections in the text and also taken various liberties with it. The Italian version of the Moreote chronicle is entitled *Istoria della Morea* in the MS. (fols. 25^r–47^r, with a note at the bottom of fol. 47^r that "manca un foglio"), inc. "Anno creduto all' imperatore," and expl. "tuttavia l'armata continuava il camino verso l' Arta ed ebbe gran dolor, e convocati il principe et conte, etc.," ed. Hopf, *op. cit.*, pp. 414–68, as noted above. The Marciana acquired the MS. in 1831.

Féodalité en Grèce médiévale, Paris, 1971, pp. 63 ff., there is some reason to believe that the extant redaction of the Assizes of Romania dates from the period between 1333 and 1346 (*ibid.*, pp. 75–82). On the fact that there was no written codification of Moreote feudal law by the beginning of the fourteenth century, note Georges Recoura, *Les Assises de Romanie: Édition critique avec une introduction et des notes*, Paris, 1930, pp. 37–40 (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 258).

⁵⁵ See in general Recoura, *Les Assises de Romanie*, pp. 48 ff., 83 ff., and esp. Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, pp. 115 ff., 174, 185 ff. Jacoby's penetrating study makes it almost possible to dispense with Recoura's introduction to his edition of the Assizes.

⁵⁶ Jacoby, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–88, 170.

has given rise to the controversy. In late years progress has been made toward understanding the relationship of the French and Greek texts to each other, but uncertainty persists on many important points, and the analysis of incomplete data inevitably deviates into rationalization, the bane of historical studies. Nevertheless, recent research has shown that the prototype of the *Chronicle of the Morea* was probably in French.⁵⁸

According to the brief prologue of the extant version, "C'est le livre de la conquête de Constantinople et de l'empire de Romanie, et dou pays de la princée de la Morée, qui fu trouvé en un livre qui fu jadis del noble baron messire Bartholomée Guys, le grant connestable, le quel livre il avoit en son chastel d'Estives." The *Chronicle*, then, as it has come down to us in the French version was drawn from a book which Bartolommeo II Ghisi, the Venetian grand constable of the principality of Achaea, once had in the famous castle of S. Omer at Thebes. He is known to have possessed the castle from 1327 to 1331. But the extant French *Chronicle*, as the author or rather redactor himself tells us, is an abridgment of the original, "si vous diray mon compte, non pas ainxi com je trovay par escript, mais au plus brief que je pourray" (par. 1).⁵⁹

References in the French *Chronicle* to the

death of Duke Niccolò I Sanudo of Naxos in July, 1341 (par. 550), and to the Latin Empress Catherine of Valois, who died in October, 1346, as still living (par. 86), *la très exçerlente dame qui ores s'appelle empereys*, at first suggest that it was written between these two dates. The problem of dating the French version is complicated by a copyist's apparent interpolations in both the prologue and the text, as Jacoby has reminded us, and although some of his arguments seem rather tenuous, and his assumptions are derived from rationalization, he has made in my opinion a rather convincing case for dating a first French redaction from the lost prototype between 1320 and 1324.⁶⁰ The pro-

⁵⁸ Jacoby, *Journ. des Savants*, 1968, pp. 133–50. Longnon, *Chronique*, p. LXXIV, believed that the prototype was written (*rédigé*) between 1305 and 1331, probably during the Ghisi tenure of Thebes, on which see below in the present note. When the apparent interpolations are omitted from the French *Chronicle*, such as the references to the destruction of the castle at Thebes (1331) and the death of Niccolò I Sanudo (1341), and the notation of events in 1331–1333 is also deleted from the chronological table prefixed to the Brussels MS. (ed. Longnon, *Chronique*, pp. 400–5, on which note the important observations of Jacoby, *op. cit.*, pp. 141–47), it is clear that the events alluded to in the *Chronicle* all come before about 1320, and in the chronological table before about 1323. But since the interpolations are identified on the basis of what "must have been the case," concern inevitably arises that maybe at least one of these interpolations was actually part of the first redaction of the French text from the prototype. Undoubtedly there are interpolations in the text, and they have been an awkward problem since A. Ellissen considered them more than a hundred years ago (*Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur*, pt. II [Leipzig, 1856], xvii–xxvii), and John Schmitt based certain arguments upon them in his dissertation on *Die Chronik von Morea*, Munich, 1889, concerning which note Longnon, *Chronique*, pp. LIV–LVII.

Bartolommeo II Ghisi could have taken up residence in the castle of Thebes from 1327 when his son Giorgio II married Simona of Aragon, the daughter of Don Alfonso Fadrique, vicar-general of the Catalan duchies of Athens and Neopatras until about 1330. The castle presumably went to Giorgio as Simona's dowry. It is tempting to believe that the writer of the French prologue knew that the "original" text of the *Chronicle* had belonged to Bartholomée Guys . . . , le quel livre il avoit en son chastel d'Estives, simply because Ghisi's name was inscribed on the fly leaf, with an indication that he had it (or acquired it?) while residing in the castle at Thebes, which (since the chronicler says it was "son chastel") would probably mean between 1327 and 1331. The Catalans, however, destroyed the castle, presumably late in 1331, lest it be taken by or turned over to Gautier VI de Brienne, titular duke of Athens, who was then trying to reconquer his father's erstwhile duchy from the Catalan Company, which had occupied Thebes and Athens in 1311 (for details, cf. K. M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, rev. ed., London, 1975, pp. 39–41, 49). On the castle itself, note R. J. Loenertz, *Les Ghisi, dynastes*

⁵⁹ There is no need to cite here the older literature on the *Chronicles*, but especial notice should be taken of Giuseppe Spadaro, "Studi introduttivi alla Cronaca di Morea," *Sicilorum gymnasium*, new ser., XII (Catania, 1959), 125–52; XIII (1960), 133–76; and esp. XIV (1961), 1–70, who after a searching analysis of the language of the Greek *Chronicle* concludes that it was drawn from a French original. Harold E. Lurier, *Crusaders as Conquerors: The Chronicle of Morea*, New York and London, 1964, who has translated the entire Greek *Chronicle*, also believes "that both the French and Greek versions . . . are derived from a prototype written in French" (p. 52). But Peter Topping in his review of Lurier's book in *Speculum*, XL (1965), 737–42, entertains some reservations, as does Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque*, Paris, 1969, pp. 15–17, who still believes with Longnon, *Chronique de Morée*, pp. LXXVI ff., that the original may have been written in Italian, probably in Venetian. M. J. Jeffreys believes in a Greek original (*Byz. Zeitschr.*, LXVIII [1975], 304–50).

⁶⁰ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, p. 1, and cf. par. 128, p. 46, relating to the assignment by Guillaume de Champlitte of the first Moreote fiefs to barons and prelates, knights, squires, and sergeants, *de quoy li livres ne fait mencion cy endroit*, which appears to be another mention of the original *Chronicle*, which also contained some notice of the jewels which Isabelle of Villehardouin gave the admiral Roger de Lluria in 1292 (par. 798), *de beaux joiaux, de quoy le livre ne fait mencion*.

tototype presumably began, like the French and Greek versions, with a rapid glance at the First Crusade and hurried on to the Fourth. It probably covered at least the whole thirteenth century, reaching a point beyond 1292, in which year the French Chronicle refers to Isabelle of Villehardouin's giving some beautiful jewels to the admiral Roger de Lluria, *de beaux joiaux, de quoy le livre ne fait mencion* (par. 798). But it is not clear how much beyond 1292 the French redactor could depend on *le livre*,⁶¹ obviously the text which Bartolommeo Ghisi once had in Thebes.

The Greek Chronicle (*Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*) is written in demotic, in the fifteen-syllable "political" verse common in Byzantine and popular modern Greek poetry. It bears all the marks of translation from another language, and Jacoby has argued very plausibly that it was based upon a complete text of the French redaction prepared between 1341 and 1346.⁶² The sole extant manuscript of the French text, now in Brussels in the Bibliothèque Royale (no. 15,702), suffers from certain lacunae; the scribe, who copied it about the year 1400, says that he reproduced it as he found it.⁶³ The

difficult question is of course whether the Greek Chronicle was adapted from a complete text of the French redaction (made between 1341 and 1346), which itself no longer exists, or from a copy like that which belonged to Ghisi, whose *livre* appears and disappears in a single reference (in the French prologue). Was Ghisi's manuscript the only text of the "prototype" ever made? What finally happened to it? No one can say. But Jacoby believes, and he may be right, that the Greek redactor could not have employed the Ghisi text in the production of his own version although he made use of known facts and an oral tradition upon which the "original" itself may have been partly based.⁶⁴

Although the Greek text breaks off abruptly in the year 1292, it also of course contains references to later events, such as the unhappy marriage and death of Niccolò I Sanudo (vv. 8032–39) and especially to Érard III le Maure (d. 1387?), who is assumed to be alive from the allusion to him in the Copenhagen manuscript (vv. 8467–69) and dead by the time of the later Paris redaction (vv. 8470–74).⁶⁵ Érard was the lord of Arcadia, son of Étienne le Maure and Agnes of Aulnay and father-in-law of the famous John Lascaris Calophorus, who had become a convert to Latin Catholicism. The suggestion has been made more than once that the author (or redactor) of the Greek Chronicle was a Moreote in the following of Érard III, to whose family he gives unusual attention.⁶⁶

The extant version of the French Chronicle breaks off abruptly in the year 1305, but the narrative of the text once extended apparently to 1320, and was probably employed to the

véniétiens dans l'Archipel, Florence, 1975, pp. 151–52, 155–56.

Jacoby, *Journ. des Savants*, 1968, p. 138, assumes that since Bartolommeo Ghisi once had the original in the castle of S. Omer, it must have been lost or destroyed in 1331, for which of course there is no proof. Before the Catalans demolished the castle, they presumably removed all contents of value. Indeed, Longnon, *Chronique*, pp. LXXIV, LXXXIV, believes that the reference in the prologue to the original, "qui fu jadis del noble baron," suggests that it did in fact pass into other hands. There is no way of knowing how long or in what hands the original survived. Jacoby, p. 137, believes that if the original had passed into other hands or been transferred elsewhere, "le prologue l'aurait sans doute signalé," but *a fortiori* if the writer of the prologue had known that the original had been destroyed in 1331, he would surely have indicated the fact. While it would appear that the copyist (or interpolator) of the prologue did not know where or whether the original existed, it is obvious that the author (or rather redactor) of the extant French Chronicle had continued access to the original, which he says he has given us "not as I found it in writing, but in the shortest form that I could" (par. 1). But was Ghisi's copy the unique text of the original?

⁶¹ Cf. Longnon, *Chronique*, pp. LIX–LX, LXXIV.

⁶² Buchon, Hopf, and Morel-Fatio believed that the Copenhagen MS. of the Greek text and the Brussels MS. of the French text both went back independently to a prototype, a more extensive form of the Chronicle written in French (Longnon, *Chronique*, p. LXV). Ellissen and Schmitt believed the prototype was in Greek.

⁶³ *Chronique [française] de Morée*, ed. Longnon, p. 399:

"Tant com j'ay trové, tant j'ay escript de ceste conquete de la Morée." The statement occurs at the conclusion of the text, which breaks off abruptly.

⁶⁴ Jacoby, *Journ. des Savants*, 1968, pp. 153 ff.

⁶⁵ Schmitt, *Chronicle of Morea* (1904), pp. 548, 549, and cf. Lurier, *Crusaders as Conquerors: Chron. of Morea* (1964), p. 307, note 54.

⁶⁶ Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 337, and Jacoby, *Journ. des Savants*, 1968, pp. 140, 157. Very likely some of the Moreote sources that went into the making of the Aragonese version of the Chronicle were collected at Érard III's court (*op. cit.*, pp. 168–69, 177–78). On Calophorus, see D. Jacoby, "Jean Lascaris Calophéros, Chypre et la Morée," in *Revue des études byzantines*, XXVI (1968), 189–228, and especially Fr. Ambrosius K. Eszer, *Das abenteuerliche Leben des Johannes Laskaris Kalophoros: Forschungen zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen im 14. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden, 1969, with the comments of R. J. Loenertz, in the *Revue des études byzantines*, XXVIII (1970), 129–39, and Jacoby, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LXIV (1971), 378–81.

latter date by the compiler of material for the so-called Aragonese Chronicle (the *Libro de los fechos*),⁶⁷ which itself comes down to the year 1377, and is based upon information derived largely from Moreote sources. The *Libro de los fechos* was apparently given its present form during the period in which the Hospitallers held the principality of Achaea on lease from the crown of Naples (1376–1381) although the sole surviving manuscript was not copied until October, 1393.⁶⁸

The purpose of the first author (or redactor) of the original *Chronicle of the Morea* was obviously to glorify the Frankish achievement of the thirteenth century. Perhaps also he wanted to inspire his contemporaries in the harassed principality with some of the resolution of their predecessors who had made the history he was interlarding with legend. If the chronicler lacked literary talent, he apparently had a sense of drama, and his narrative could move rapidly. He had an exciting subject. Both the French prose and the Greek jingle that have come down to us, however, are tiresome to read in long stretches. But they are a valuable source for Moreote social customs, feudal institutions, and the mentality of the military caste whose sense of honor and adherence to law, low cunning and deeds of valor they celebrate.

The conquest of the Morea had taken more than forty years. It differed from the crusaders' violent occupation of Palestine and Cyprus (and Constantinople) in that few of the native residents of the Morea had either fled or been killed as the Fourth Crusaders extended their sway in the peninsula. The Greek *archontes*, as we have already seen, had retained in large part their non-feudal, patrimonial possessions. In the course of the next century some of the more prominent pro-Latin members of this class were knighted according to the western ritual, received offices and additional lands, swore fealty and did homage as vassals to their Frankish lords, and were drawn into the feudal

hierarchy of the principality. In the fourteenth century Moreote lords with Greek names like Misitos (*Misito*), Koutroulis (*Cutrullus*), Mourmouris (*Murmurus*), and Maroulis (*Marulli*) are to be found in the ranks of the Latin feudality, and were inevitably caught up in the strife attending Angevin domination in the peninsula.⁶⁹

The Angevin brothers were not in agreement among themselves as to what disposition to make of the Latin Morea. Robert the Wise, however, finally secured the principality for his younger brother John of Gravina, who did homage as prince of Achaea to the titular Latin Emperor Philip of Taranto. John of Gravina was prince from 1322 to 1333, and as he assumed his various responsibilities, Pope John XXII tried to effect the return of some of his faltering subjects to the bosom of Mother Church. On 1 October, 1322, the pope wrote the Latin patriarch of Constantinople and the archbishop of Patras that "certainly not without bitterness of mind have we learned in these days that good Christians in the principality of Achaea, who are commonly called Latins in those parts, living as they do with Greek schismatics and other unfaithful, sometimes themselves (and their wives and families too) ignorantly accept the said schismatics' rite to the peril of their souls and quite often go to hear [Greek] masses and make offerings to schismatic priests, and boldly receive the sacraments of the Church from these same priests according to the [Greek] rite, and the Latins do not fear to admit schismatics to masses and other divine offices which are celebrated according to the rite of the Sacrosanct Roman Church." Such aberrances were no longer to be tolerated.⁷⁰

John of Gravina was not primarily concerned, however, with ecclesiastical considerations when in 1325–1326 he made an expedition into the Morea against the Byzantines of Mistra, the last considerable Latin offensive against the Moreote Greeks. Although he wanted to extend and to make more secure Angevin authority in the peninsula, he

⁶⁷ Cf. Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fechos* (1885), pref., pp. LVII–LIX, who has observed that "l'auteur aragonais manifeste à chaque page qu'il a eu sous les yeux un livre français. . . . Le compilateur aragonais a eu recours à un texte parfois plus complet que celui du manuscrit de Bruxelles et qui en diffère souvent," a view which Schmitt and Ad. Adamantou disputed (Longnon, *Chronique*, p. LXII).

⁶⁸ Jacoby, *Journ. des Savants*, 1968, esp. pp. 148, 160–77.

⁶⁹ David Jacoby, "Les Archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque," in *Travaux et mémoires*, II (Paris, 1967), 470–78; Longnon and Topping, *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV^e siècle* (1969), pp. 21, 33, 45, 48, 52, 73, 121 ff., 127 ff., 149, 150, 196, 198, 213 f., 226 f., et alibi.

⁷⁰ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1322, no. 48, vol. XXIV (Bar-le-Duc, 1872), pp. 187–88.

achieved nothing more than great expenditure, some of which had been met by the Florentine banking house of the Acciajuoli, who were soon repaid for their loans by grants of the fiefs of Lechaina and La Mandria in the northwestern Morea. In 1333, John of Gravina's claims to the Moreote principality were purchased with funds advanced by the Acciajuoli; Robert of Taranto, son of Philip and the titular Latin Empress Catherine of Valois, became the prince of Achaea (1333–1364). By this time the ambitious Niccolò Acciajuoli, Petrarch's honored friend, was becoming a dominant figure at the Neapolitan court, and his family's banking house gave up to him the fiefs of Lechaina and La Mandria. The Empress Catherine and Robert, "despot of Romania and prince of Achaea and Taranto," confirmed the transfer on 22 February, 1335;⁷¹ on the following 1 February (1336) they received Niccolò as a vassal of the principality of Achaea, in *ligium prefati principatus Achaye*.⁷² There was increasing trouble in the Morea, which would occupy Niccolò to the end of his days, and increasing opposition to the Angevins. Anxiety was caused in Naples by the robustly independent archbishops of Patras, who claimed to hold their great ecclesiastical barony directly from the pope; as well as by the Latin baronage, which hardly concealed its distrust of Angevin emissaries; and by the Byzantines of Mistra, now perilously strong; the adventurous Catalans in the Athenian duchy; and the Turkish corsairs

of the Anatolian coast, who terrorized the Aegean islands and did not spare the Moreote coasts.

Pope John XXII died in December, 1334, and was succeeded by Benedict XII. On 20 March, 1335, Benedict wrote Robert of Naples from Avignon:

Not without great distress have we learned of the dire afflictions which the infidel Turks are striving to inflict upon the Christians of Romania, as they have done up to now. We and the envoys of our most beloved son . . . Philip, illustrious king of France, the members of the Hospital of S. John of Jerusalem, and the ambassadors . . . of the doge and commune of Venice, now at the Apostolic See—we have issued orders to send an armada of galleys for the defense of the Christians and the repression of the said Turks . . . for this year, as was done last year. Although this matter is clearly the concern of all faithful Christians, because nevertheless it concerns you especially, most beloved son, as your Majesty well knows, we are confident that you, who more than any other prince whatsoever can make gains in that area, will bend your every effort to come forth with prompt and efficacious subsidies and aids to advance this purpose. . . .

Benedict implored Robert to join with the Holy See, France, the Hospitallers, and Venice to help the eastern Christians and repel the raging arrogance of the Turks, that he might heap up merits in heaven and increase his fame on earth.⁷³

The wisdom of hindsight would eventually make it clear that in the fourteenth century contemporaries exaggerated the resources of the Angevin kingdom of Naples. Robert had his own troubles, and could do little to help the crusade. In late December, 1331, his brother Philip of Taranto had died at Naples, ineffectually cherishing his title as Latin emperor of Constantinople by virtue of his marriage (in 1313) with the heiress Catherine of Valois-Courtenay. The Latin Empress Catherine now went into the Morea herself, with all her family, accompanied by Niccolò Acciajuoli, who had by this time received many fiefs in the north and west of the peninsula (1336–1338), and whom gossip reputed to be Catherine's lover. Her purpose in going had nothing to do with the crusade, which Pope Benedict XII was trying to preach to unlistening ears.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II (1845): *Florence*, doc. II, pp. 32–44, and cf. no. III, doc. dated 22 January, 1336, pp. 46–50. The associates of the Acciajuoli company transferred Lechaina and La Mandria to Niccolò on 1 September, 1334 (*op. cit.*, II, doc. II, pp. 35 ff.). Since Robert of Taranto was a minor, and royal acquiescence was desirable in any event, King Robert the Wise of Naples confirmed on 28 June, 1336, and 27 April, 1342, the grants made by Catherine and her son to Niccolò Acciajuoli (*op. cit.*, II, docs. III and XV, pp. 44–51, 109–14). By 1342 Niccolò had received extensive additional grants, including the barony of Kalamata and the fortress of Piada in the Argolid, and the royal deed of confirmation states that Catherine had secured a loan of some 40,000 ounces (of gold, amounting to 200,000 florins) from the Acciajuoli company [*societas Acharellorum*] for the purchase of the principality of Achaea, "as well as for maintaining the said principality and defending it strongly against diverse, powerful, and hostile neighbors—Greeks, Catalans, and Turks—failing which, heaven forbid, the said duchy might have been exposed to grave dangers and losses . . ." (doc. XV, pp. 112–13). In his life of Niccolò, Matteo Palmieri gives surprisingly little attention to the affairs of Greece (ed. Gino Scaramella, in *R/SS*, XIII-2 [Bologna, 1934], pp. 6, 8, 29, 31).

⁷² Buchon, *op. cit.*, II: *Florence*, doc. V, pp. 65–67.

⁷³ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1335, no. 29, vol. XXV (1872), p. 31, "datum Avin. XIII Kal. Aprilis, anno I."

⁷⁴ Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1336, nos. 40–41,

Like John of Gravina before her, Catherine wanted to set the princely authority in the Morea upon firmer foundations and to help defend it against the attacks of the Greeks, Catalans, and Turks. Catherine's young son Robert now bore the princely title. She remained with her entourage in the Morea for two years and a half (from November, 1338, to June, 1341).⁷⁵ Her graciousness and apparently genuine interest in the land, together with Niccolò's energy and astuteness, accomplished something. More was done by Acciajuoli money, but not enough, and in 1341 certain Moreote feudatories appealed to John [VI] Cantacuzenus, then the grand domestic: they were willing to accept the suzerainty of Byzantium in exchange for security in their possessions.⁷⁶ A large group of barons next appealed to James II of Majorca. Nothing came of these overtures, for the principals were otherwise engaged. In France the Hundred Years' War had come; the Hungarians invaded the kingdom of Naples; and the Frankish Morea was left to shift for itself. The imperial historian John Cantacuzenus laments the destruction wrought in the Morea by Turkish corsairs and Frankish knights, as well as by the internecine strife of the Greeks themselves; the Morea had

become "more desolate than the land of the Scythians," says Cantacuzenus, employing a common Byzantine phrase (drawn from Aristophanes), when in 1349 his son Manuel was sent into the country as its despot, whereupon Manuel accomplished miracles of reconstruction.⁷⁷ The Latins thus needed some success of their own to set against the Byzantine achievement in the Morea, but what success they did achieve was, as we shall see, won across the Aegean at Smyrna, and the Morea had little share in it except to enjoy the cessation of piracy.

On 21 April, 1358, Robert of Taranto, who had become the titular Latin emperor upon his mother Catherine's death (in 1346), granted Niccolò Acciajuoli, now grand seneschal of the kingdom of Naples, the city and castellany of Corinth with all its dependencies, for he alone could furnish protection against Turkish depredation and Byzantine ambition.⁷⁸ Niccolò obviously enjoyed the role of defender of Christendom against the Turks, and on the following 5 August (1358) Pope Innocent VI had occasion to thank him for offering to go on an expedition against the Turks and apparently to devote his fortune to outfitting the necessary naval force. The pope did not think the time was ripe for such an expedition although he had already appointed a commission of cardinals to study the possibility of a crusade, but he assured Niccolò that the time would come when he might indeed show himself an obedient soldier of Christ and a faithful athlete of the Church militant.⁷⁹ The Angevins of Naples carefully preserved the royal title of Jerusalem

43-45, vol. XXV (Bar-le-Duc, 1872), pp. 75-76, 77-78; ad ann. 1337, nos. 24, 33, pp. 103-4, 109-10; ad ann. 1338, nos. 72, 73 ff., pp. 140-41 ff. [on the Tatar embassy to Avignon]; ad ann. 1339, nos. 19 ff., pp. 159 ff. [Barlaam's mission to Avignon seeking assistance for the Greeks against the Turks]; and ad ann. 1340, nos. 23-24, 28, pp. 198-99, 200.

⁷⁵ Niccolò Acciajuoli left Naples for the Morea with Catherine of Valois on 10 October, 1338 (Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II [1845]: Florence, doc. XIII, p. 106, letter of one Domenico Bonciani to Niccolò's father Acciajuolo Acciajuoli, dated 14 October, 1338). Their stay lasted two years and six months, since they departed for home on 16 June, 1341 (cf. Catherine's own account in Leopoldo Tanfani, *Niccola Acciajuoli*, Florence, 1863, p. 42, note 3): "... die sextodecimo ipsius mensis Iunii [none indictionis] nobis recedentibus de partibus supradictis, quod totum tempus est annorum duorum et mensium sex. . . ." On 28 August, 1341, Boccaccio wrote Niccolò from Florence, congratulating him upon his safe return from the Morea (Buchon, *op. cit.*, II: Florence, doc. XVI, pp. 114-16). Note also Tanfani, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-44, 227-28, and Léonard, *La Jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}*, I (1932), 184-85.

⁷⁶ Cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), p. 326; Geo. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, Oxford, 1956, pp. 454-55; and cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* (1975), p. 65. The extant French version of the Chronicle of the Morea could have been prepared for Catherine of Valois while she was residing in the principality (note the interesting observations of Longnon, *op. cit.*, p. 325).

⁷⁷ John Cantacuzenus, *Hist.*, IV, 13 (Bonn, III, 85-86).

⁷⁸ Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II: Florence, doc. XXV, pp. 143-53, and cf. docs. XXVI-XXIX. A despairing letter to Robert of Taranto dated at Corinth on 5 February, 1358, had lamented the "continue et insupportables afflictiones quibus ab infidelibus Turchis affligimur omni die" (II, doc. XXV, p. 145). Tanfani, *Niccola Acciajuoli*, pp. 120-22; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 285-87; and Léonard, *Jeanne I^{re}*, III: *Le Règne de Louis de Tarente*, Monaco and Paris, 1937, pp. 329, 371-72.

On the Moreote fiefs, which had become extensive from 1336, of Niccolò Acciajuoli and his heirs, see Longnon and Topping, *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV^e siècle* (1969), docs. I-VI, IX-XII, and cf. in general Bon, *La Morée franque* (1969), esp. vol. I, 208 ff. There is nothing new (and unfortunately many errors) in Curzio Ugurgieri della Berardenga, *Gli Acciaiuoli di Firenze nella luce dei loro tempi*, 2 vols., Florence, 1962, II, 350-406.

⁷⁹ Buchon, *op. cit.*, II: Florence, doc. XXII, pp. 135-36.

in their titulature, and although Niccolò may possibly have dreamed of reasserting his sovereigns' ancient rights to the vanished Latin kingdom in the Holy Land,⁸⁰ one can hardly take very seriously Niccolò's conventional obeisance to the crusading ideal, the profession of which was only a gesture of some personal and diplomatic value to any prince or statesman who found himself in a position to strike the pose of crusader. Niccolò Acciajuoli was, nevertheless, one of the great figures of his time in Italy and a tower of Latin strength in the Morea. He died in early November, 1365, a year after Robert of Taranto, whose widow Marie de Bourbon now claimed to be princess of Achaea (1364–1370). This caused dissension and war yet again in the principality, since Philip [II] of Taranto, younger brother of Robert, also asserted his right to the succession (1364–1373). But when Niccolò Acciajuoli died, he left his family well established in the Morea, where he had acquired the extensive holdings we have noted,⁸¹ and a generation later his adopted son Nerio added to the

prestige of the Acciajuoli by gaining the Athenian duchy.

Late in the year 1373 Philip [II] of Taranto was succeeded in his claims to the Latin empire and the principality of Achaea by his nephew, Jacques des Baux, whose suzerain, Joanna I of Naples, promptly contested his rights and claimed the Morea for herself. After a disturbed administration of almost three years in the Morea, Joanna I leased the principality, apparently in early August, 1376, for five years, at 4,000 gold ducats a year, to the Hospitallers. About a year later Juan Fernández de Heredia, one of the most interesting and cultured *grands seigneurs* of his age, was named master of the Hospitallers, who held the principality the full length of their lease, involving Heredia very deeply in the troubled affairs of Greece.

A document of the year 1376–1377, still preserved in the Archives of the Order of S. John in Malta, gives a list of the Moreote feudatories and their tenures. It was probably prepared at the time the Hospitallers leased the principality from Joanna of Naples. The list identifies a total of some fifty-two castles (*castelli*) and two other districts less strongly defended. Of these, fifteen are attributed to Joanna as princess of Achaea (*li castelli che Madama ave in lo principato de Achaya*), and thirty-seven to the Moreote feudatories, including the archbishop of Patras and the Hospitallers themselves, who already held two castles in the peninsula at the time they negotiated their lease with Joanna. The archbishop, then Paolo Foscari, held seven *fortize*, including that of Patras. Niccolò Acciajuoli's son Angelo, then the grand seneschal, possessed eleven, together with one less well fortified district (*terre*), and Niccolò's adopted son Nerio Acciajuoli, later lord of Corinth and duke of Athens, held three, which means that the Acciajuoli possessed fourteen castles in the Morea, only one less than the princess of Achaea.⁸² For a family which knew how to

⁸⁰ Cf. É. G. Léonard, *La Jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}*, I, 100–3.

⁸¹ The Certosa outside Florence (. . . in comitatu Florentie quoddam monasterium ordinis Cartusiensis), where Niccolò Acciajuoli now lies buried, was partly built from the spoils of Greece (cf. Catherine of Valois's concession to Niccolò of 15 July, 1338, in Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II: *Florence*, doc. XI, pp. 104–5). In his first will (dated on 28 September, 1338), made out before he departed for the Morea with Catherine of Valois, Niccolò provided that the Certosa should be built with the income of his holdings in the Morea: "E però che questo luogo [uno munistero dell'ordine di Certosa il quale si chiami santo Lorenzo] richiederà grande moneta a metterlo a seguzione, sì lascio e voglio che tutti i frutti della terra mia la quale io tengo o tenessi nel principato della Morea si convertano e si sribuiscano nel detto luogo a compiere, acciò che più tosto vi si possa uficiare e fare i servigi di Dio . . ." (Leopoldo Tanfani, *Niccola Acciajuoli*, Florence, 1863, pp. 35–36). In the defense of his career which Niccolò later made in a long letter to Angelo Soderini (on 26 December, 1364), he noted that it was believed or at least stated at the papal court in Avignon that he had been given so much crown land for his services to the Angevins that the Neapolitan *census* could hardly be paid to the Holy See (Tanfani, *op. cit.*, p. 228, with a better text in Gino Scaramella, ed., *Matthei Palmerii Vita Nicolai Acciajuoli*, in *RiSS*, XIII–2 [Bologna, 1934], p. xvii, and app. I, pp. 49–50). Niccolò denied the charge, pointing out that his duties as grand seneschal of the kingdom had nothing to do with the collection or disbursement of funds (Tanfani, pp. 230–31, and Scaramella, p. 51). Improved texts of both Niccolò's holograph will of 28 September, 1338, and his dictated will of 30 September, 1359, may be found in appendices to Scaramella's edition of Palmieri's *Vita Nicolai*, pp. 57–80.

⁸² The list of the Moreote feudatories, assigned by Hopf to the year 1364, was first correctly dated 1377 by Anthony T. Luttrell, "A Fourteenth-Century List of the Barons of Achaea (1377?)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LI (1958), 355–56, and "The Principality of Achaea in 1377," *ibid.*, LVII (1964), 340–45, who gives an improved text of the document (pp. 343–45), which had previously been published by Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes*, pp. 227–29, where reference is omitted to Patras among the *fortize de Archivescovo de Patraxo*. Cf. also Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, vol. 86 (repr., II), 7; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 287, 290–91; Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 329–30. Of the fifty-four places mentioned in the document

exploit them, these lands possessed more than political and military importance. There was in truth little industry in the Morea, and the products of the linen and flour mills on the Acciajuoli properties were not sufficient for a significant export trade, but there was a fair abundance of olives, oil, figs, grapes, currants, cheese, cows, sheep, chickens, partridges, and of course wax. Wax was commonly worth five sterlins a pound (with twenty sterlins to the hyperper), and was in constant demand for seals, decorative purposes, and candles in homes as well as churches.

Before long the "Navarrese Company" (or rather Companies) arrived in the Morea, and after serving the Hospital of S. John for a while looked for lands for themselves, finally recognizing Jacques des Baux as their prince and suzerain (1381–1383).⁸³ Jacques des Baux also bore the Latin imperial title. The Navarrese Company will be considered below in connection with the Catalan history of Athens. Suffice

cited, the castle of *la terre de Mayna* had been in Byzantine hands since 1262, and the grand seneschal's *terre de la Cristiana* in the "Grisera," i.e., the lower valley of the Alpheus, between Elis and Triphylia, seems to have contained no significant fortress. Nerio Acciajuoli was the *singiore de la Avostitza* (i.e. Vostitza).

Although Luttrell believes that Joanna I leased the principality of Achaea to the Hospitallers "about June 1377" (cf. his chapter in Setton and Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, III [1975], 302, and his article in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVII [1964], 341–42), there seems to be no evidence that the lease did not run for the full five years. The principality was returned to Joanna shortly (*nuper*) before 24 August, 1381, which would put the beginning of the lease in late July or early August, 1376, on which see R. J. Loenertz, "Hospitalliers et Navarrais en Grèce (1376–1383): Regestes et documents," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXII (1956), reg. nos. 1, 29, pp. 329–30, 337, and note p. 351, from the financial accounts of the Order, dated at Rhodes 24 August, 1381, reprinted in Loenertz's *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, pp. 339, 347, 361.

⁸³ Cf. in general the documentary study of R. J. Loenertz, "Hospitalliers et Navarrais en Grèce, 1376–1383," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXII, reg. nos. 37–38, 40–43, 45–49, 51, 53–54, 57, 59–60, 62–63, 66, pp. 340–49.

it to say at this point that a state of constant hostility existed between the Navarrese Company and the Greek Despot Theodore I Palaeologus of Mistra (1382–1407).⁸⁴ The Turks used the opportunity to pillage, and the Morea continued to suffer. A Venetian document of October, 1407, reports that Turkish raids had been so severe in the territory of Coron that agricultural workers could not be found for hire even for gold, "et le possession et terre de i diti vostri citadini son per la maor parte silvestre et en gran disolation."⁸⁵

When Jacques des Baux died in July, 1383, three or four pretenders, with contestable rights inherited from the vagaries of Angevin policy in the past, laid claim to the title prince of Achaea. One of them, Amadeo of Savoy, planned an ambitious expedition to take over his alleged inheritance (in 1390–1391), but nothing came of these plans. At length, the then commander of the Navarrese Company in the Morea, Pedro Bordo de San Superano, declared himself twentieth prince of Achaea (1396–1402); he was fraudulently succeeded by his wife's nephew, Centurione II Zaccaria (1404–1432), who finally lost the now much-diminished principality in 1430 to the Greek despots of the Morea. Thirty years later, in 1460, the Despots Thomas and Demetrius, brothers of the last Byzantine emperor, Constantine XI Palaeologus, lost the peninsula to the Turks under the redoubtable Mehmed II "the Conqueror," to whom Constantinople had fallen seven years before. In later chapters we shall be concerned with these events.

⁸⁴ Theodore arrived in the Morea about the end of 1382 (Loenertz, "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," in the *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II [Studi e testi, 232], Città del Vaticano, 1964, pp. 417–20).

⁸⁵ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Grazie, Reg. 20 (originally no. 17, Oct. 1407–Jan. 1416, *more veneto*), fols. 4^v–5^r [2^v–3^r], cited by N. Iorga, "Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle," in *Revue de l'Orient latin*, IV (1896), 290.

9. THE AVIGNONESE PAPACY, THE CRUSADE, AND THE CAPTURE OF SMYRNA (1309–1345)

THIRTY YEARS after the Greek recovery of Constantinople, the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem came to an end. The coastal city of S. Jean d'Acre fell to al-Ashraf Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Khalīl, young sultan of Egypt, in May, 1291, and soon there was nothing left in the Holy Land of the conquests made by the First Crusaders two centuries before. Acre was lost during the short reign of Pope Nicholas IV, Jerome of Ascoli, whom in an earlier chapter we have met as an active participant in eastern affairs, but despite his every effort Nicholas could do nothing to stem the tide of Mamluk victory.¹ His death was followed by an interregnum of more than two years (from April, 1292, to July, 1294). The hermit Pietro da Morrone was chosen to succeed him as Celestine V, but after a bewildered five months he abdicated in what Dante appears to call *il gran rifiuto* (*Inf.*, III, 58–60). Next came Boniface VIII, who declared a crusade against his enemies, the Colonnese; became hopelessly involved in the contest with Philip IV of France; and suffered the outrage at Anagni at the hands of Sciarra Colonna and Guillaume de Nogaret.² When Boniface died in October, 1303, one could safely assume that the papacy was in no position for members of the Curia to think seriously of trying to resume the leadership of a crusade, although they would certainly encourage and support any prince who was prepared to venture into the Levant against the enemies of the Church.

Boniface VIII was succeeded by Benedict XI, whose brief reign closed with his death at Perugia in July, 1304, and after a year's interregnum Bertrand de Got, archbishop of Bordeaux, was elected as Clement V (on 5 June, 1305). We need not be concerned with Clement's various places

of residence during the years which followed. In March, 1309, he settled in Avignon, surrounded by influential, independent, and intriguing cardinals. As Clement took up his lodgings in the Dominican convent, one of the chief problems engaging the Curia was the future of the Ghibelline city of Pisa. James II of Aragon was trying to secure suzerainty over Pisa by bribing certain of the cardinals while he was planning the permanent occupation of the "kingdom of Sardinia and Corsica." To achieve his ends James had sent his faithful envoy Vidal de Villanova to the Curia, and while Vidal did not succeed in gaining the papal cession of Pisa to the Crown of Aragon, his reports are among the most informative sources we have concerning the early years of the Curia's establishment at Avignon.³ We shall return to them later.

The fourteenth century began as a relatively peaceful era in the eastern Mediterranean. The Catalan Grand Company, to be sure, disrupted life in the northern Aegean, and there was a good deal of commotion in Constantinople, but Venetian and Genoese galleys sailed into Egyptian ports and even into those of the Black Sea with far fewer attacks upon each other's commerce than in the preceding century. Venetian hostility to Byzantium, however, cooled slowly despite the growing danger from the Turks. On 8 April, 1301, for example, the Venetian duke of Crete informed the Doge Pietro Gradenigo that, when the Republic's armada (*exercitus galearum*) reached Crete on an expedition then being planned against the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II Palaeologus, the Cretan contingent of men-at-arms, horses, supplies, and ships would be ready "ad persecutionem imperatoris et gentis eius."⁴ Although the Venetians made

¹ While Acre was under siege, and after it had fallen, there had been talk of a crusade; see Heinrich Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I (Berlin and Leipzig, 1908), docs. 1–2, 7, pp. 1–7, 11–13, and note the work of the crusading publicists to whom reference is made below.

² An extensive collection of sources, mostly from the period 1296–1311, was made by the French archivist Pierre Dupuy, *Histoire du différend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel, roy de France*, Paris, 1655, repr. Tucson, 1963; the pro-papal and pro-royal tracts of the period are analyzed by Richard Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz' VIII*, Stuttgart, 1903, repr. Amsterdam, 1969.

³ On conditions in the Curia (and the Pisan question) at the time of Clement V's settlement in Avignon, note Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, docs. 354 ff., pp. 529 ff., letters of Vidal de Villanova to James II of Aragon in March and April, 1309. The Dominican convent, to the southwest of the (later) papal palace, was the scene of the conclaves of 1334 and 1342.

⁴ G. M. Thomas, ed., *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, I (Venice, 1880, repr. New York, 1965), doc. no. 1, pp. 1–2: The Venetians staged a very formidable naval demonstration before Constantinople on 21–22 July, 1302, on which see R. J. Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie

peace with the Byzantine government on 4 October, 1302,⁵ they were ready enough to hearken to Pope Clement V's call to a crusade a few years later (in 1306–1307) when they were to join Charles of Valois, the new titular Latin emperor, in an effort to expel the Palaeologi from Constantinople and to re-establish the Latin empire.⁶

byzantines," *Revue des études byzantines*, XVII (Paris, 1959), 158–62. In the Byzantine empire, despite my reference in the text to the early fourteenth century as a relatively peaceful era, conditions sometimes approached chaos. Lacking employment, after the peace of Caltabellotta (31 August, 1302) had ended the twenty years' war between the houses of Anjou and Aragon, the Catalan Grand Company had come east under the command of the adventurous Roger de Flor to help Andronicus II stem the advance of the Turks in Asia Minor. The Company arrived in Constantinople in September, 1303, spent the winter at Cyzicus on the southern (Anatolian) shore of the Sea of Marmara, and fought successfully against the Turks during the spring and early summer of 1304. Andronicus then recalled Roger de Flor and the Company from Asia Minor, where their presence was almost as great a menace to the Greek inhabitants as it was to the Turkish invaders.

Roger and the Company settled into Gallipoli (in August and September, 1304). When Andronicus's son and co-ruler Michael IX connived in Roger's murder at the end of April, 1305, the Company found itself at war with the Byzantines. For more than two years, until their withdrawal westward in the summer of 1307, the Company ravaged Thrace and threatened Constantinople, where famine decimated the population during the terrible winter of 1306–1307. While Andronicus searched in vain for allies against the Company, and the Greek Patriarch Athanasius I railed against the indifference of Byzantine officials and of the rich to the sufferings of their poor compatriots, it almost looked as though the empire might go under, on which see the detailed account in A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328*, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 130–99, and cf. Roger Sablonier, *Krieg und Kriegerum in der Crònica des Ramón Muntaner*, Bern and Frankfurt/M., 1971.

⁵ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 7, pp. 12–16. Andronicus confirmed the pact on 7 March, 1303 (*ibid.*, I, no. 8, pp. 16–19); cf. George Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, IV, 24 (Bonn, II, 326–27), who notes both the Veneto-Byzantine truce and the Turkish advance. The Venetians were much concerned "propter scandala que habebamus olim cum Januensibus" (p. 14), because much of the trouble which then obtained in Greek waters was due to Andronicus II's persistent preference for the Genoese over the Venetians (cf. Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1959, pp. 152, 156), which was not surprising since a Venetian squadron had burned the Genoese colony at Pera in July, 1296, and a number of Greek houses had also gone up in flames (Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire . . .," *Revue des études byzantines*, XVII, 166). The Veneto-Byzantine peace of 1302–1303 was reaffirmed in 1310, and other truces were negotiated in 1324, 1331, and 1342 (*Dipl.*, I, 19).

⁶ Charles of Valois was the younger brother of Philip IV of France: "fils de roi, frère de roi, père de roi et jamais roi," Charles had married the titular Latin Empress Catherine of Courtenay (on 28 January, 1301), the twenty-year-old

Clement V certainly did his best to prepare the way. On 14 January, 1306, he wrote Guy de Plailly, bishop of Senlis and papal collector in France, lamenting the misfortunes which had befallen Christendom as a result of the Greek schism. He announced that Charles of Valois, count of Anjou and husband of the titular Latin Empress Catherine, was preparing to reconquer the empire of Constantinople from Andronicus II, "for if, which heaven forbid, the empire shall chance to fall to the Turks and the other Saracens and infidels, by whom the said Andronicus is being continually attacked, it would not be easy to wrest it from their hands! What grave danger and great confusion the mother Church of Rome and the entire Christian religion would suffer if, which God avert, such an event should occur!" It behooved Clement to assist Charles and the noble barons who were going with him to recover the empire and return it to the Catholic faith; moreover he was merely following, he said, the lead of his predecessor Benedict XI, who had in fact just written Guy de Plailly in this connection when death overtook him in July, 1304. Now, taking up the reins which Benedict had dropped, Clement ordered Guy and the papal subcollectors in France to make available to Charles of Valois, at the proper time, the legacies, redemptions of vows, and all offerings (except tithes) pledged to the assistance of the Holy Land.⁷

daughter of Beatrice of Anjou and Philip, the eldest son of the Latin Emperor Baldwin II. Catherine died in October 1307, leaving the Latin imperial title to her daughter Catherine of Valois, who later married Philip of Taranto (on 30 July, 1313), one of the several sons of Charles II of Naples. On Charles of Valois and his imperial dream, see especially Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 200–20, 233–37, 240–41, and cf. Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, Paris, 1949, pp. 281, 295–98; J. Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1886, I, 43–47; H. Moranville, "Les Projets de Charles de Valois sur l'empire de Constantinople," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LI (1890), 63–86, who publishes from the original MS. in the "Collection Baluze" in the Bibliothèque Nationale the "mises et despens pour le voiage de Constantinoble," showing that Charles expended large sums "pour le fait de l'empire."

⁷ *Regestum Clementis Papae V*, Rome, 1885–88, annus primus, no. 243, pp. 40–41, "datum Lugduni [Lyon] XVIII Kal. Februarii." Cf. C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 13, 451, according to which Guy de Plailly was bishop of Senlis, a suffragan see of Rheims, from 1294 to his death on 9 May, 1308. For Benedict XI's letter to Guy de Plailly, dated 20 June, 1304, to which Clement referred and from which he took the phraseology of his own letter, see Chas. Grandjean, ed., *Les Registres de Benoît XI*, Paris, 1883–1905, no. 1006, cols. 605–7. On the same day Benedict had appealed to the *universi Christi fideles* to take part in Charles of Valois's expedition against

Papal scribes were busy, that 14 January, on Charles of Valois's behalf. Jacopo de Nernia, bishop of Cefalù in Sicily, had just been appointed collector of an island tithe "*pro recuperatione imperii Constantinopolitani*." Clement had imposed the tithe for two years upon all ecclesiastical incomes in the island of Sicily (*Sicilia*) as a subvention for Charles. The levy fell upon both the secular and the regular clergy; only the Hospitallers and Templars were exempted from payment. The funds, once collected, were to be kept safe. If Frederick II, Catalan king of Sicily (*Trinacria*), would accompany Charles on the expedition to the Bosphorus "with a fitting company of warriors," he was to receive the tithe. Otherwise it would go directly to Charles to help defray his expenses.⁸ A similar tithe was imposed upon the kingdom of Naples (called the *regnum Sicilie*), where Bartolommeo, a papal chaplain and bishop-elect of Brindisi, was appointed the collector. If Philip of Taranto would go on Charles's expedition to rewin the empire of Constantinople, he was to receive the tithe; otherwise the money thus collected in southern Italy would, like the avails of Sicily, be given to Charles to help finance his eastward passage.⁹

In France a tithe had already been conceded to Philip IV, but if he would postpone his claim thereto, collection of a two years' tithe on behalf of his brother Charles might begin on the coming feast of the nativity of S. John the Baptist (24

June, 1306). Otherwise the two years' levy would begin when the financial assignment to Philip had been fulfilled. Clement did not want the levy to fall upon ecclesiastical incomes which were less than 10 pounds of Tours per annum, and in France as elsewhere the Hospitallers and Templars were exempted.¹⁰ Looking ahead for a moment, we may note that Philip did eventually yield to his brother's more urgent need, and his *pia benignitas* was rewarded with an additional year's tithe on 3 June, 1307, at which time the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II was excommunicated, and all rulers were forbidden to form any *societas vel confederatio* with him.¹¹

Among the papal letters of 14 January, 1306, relating to the "business of the empire," is one to Charles of Valois himself, granting those who went with him on the expedition against the Greeks the same forgiveness of sins as those who fought for the liberation of the Holy Land.¹² Another letter of the same date was dispatched to the doge and commune of Venice, blasting the schism of the "eastern church seduced by a damnable deception from the fold of Peter and from union with the Catholic Church," which had led Pope Martin IV to excommunicate the "late Michael Palaeologus, fautor of the aforesaid schism." Charles's forthcoming expedition would throw the fear of God into the Moslems, and Clement requested the Venetians to assist in this glorious undertaking and receive the crusading indulgence as their reward.¹³

The Venetians expected more than spiritual rewards for their pains. On 19 December, 1306, they made a pact with Charles of Valois "for the defense of the faith and the recovery of the empire of Romania, which is now held by Andronicus Palaeologus. . . ." The expedition was to assemble at Brindisi the following March. It would last for a year. The Venetians would supply galleys and transports at a reason-

the Byzantine empire, *ad recuperandum dictum imperium in personis propriis*, granting the participants the usual remission of their sins (*ibid.*, no. 1007, cols. 607-8, and Giuseppe Müller, ed., *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi*, Florence, 1879, pt. I, no. LXXV, pp. 112-13). On 27 June, however, Benedict had also written Charles of Valois that he was deferring both the *generalis predicatio crucis* and the grant of a tithe of ecclesiastical incomes, which Charles had requested, until conditions improved in the kingdom of France, at which time he would accede to Charles's wishes (*Registres de Benoît XI*, no. 108, cols. 608-9).

⁸ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus primus, no. 244, pp. 41-43. The Sicilian tithe was for two years, not three, as the Benedictine editor, *loc. cit.*, writes by a slip of the pen. Jacopo de Nernia was bishop of Cefalù from 1304 to his death (before 22 January, 1324, according to Eubel, I, 182). Since the collection of this tithe was postponed, the pope reimposed it upon the island of Sicily on 3 June, 1307 (*Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, no. 1755, pp. 52-55).

⁹ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus primus, no. 246, p. 44; Eubel, I, 149, on Bartolommeo. Philip of Taranto was, however, granted a tithe to be collected in the principality of Achaea, in "Romania," and elsewhere in order to recover lands which the Greeks had occupied (*Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, nos. 1604-5, pp. 17-19, dated 5 May, 1307).

¹⁰ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus primus, no. 245, pp. 43-44, dated 14 January, 1306.

¹¹ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, nos. 1758-59, pp. 55-56, dated 3 June, 1307; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 33-34, pp. 61-62.

¹² *Reg. Clem. V*, annus primus, no. 247, pp. 44-45. Hope of recovering the Holy Land inspired an extraordinary series of bulls addressed to the Hospitallers and the high clergy throughout Europe and the Levant on 11 August, 1308 (*ibid.*, annus tertius, nos. 2987-2990, pp. 153-65, and *cf.* nos. 2996-97, 3010, 3219, *et alibi*).

¹³ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus primus, no. 248, pp. 45-46; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 21, p. 38, wrongly dated 15 January (1306); R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, I (Venice, 1876), bk. 1, no. 260, p. 56.

able price, and in the event of victory they could look forward to regaining the privileged position they had enjoyed in the Latin empire before the Greek reconquest of Constantinople in 1261.¹⁴ Charles seemed to be getting off to a good start. From Bordeaux on 10 March, 1307, Pope Clement wrote the archbishop of Ravenna and all the bishops in the Romagna, ordering that the crusade be preached in their territory, as was also to be done in the kingdom of Sicily, the Veneto, and the March of Ancona. The cross was to be given to those who would bear it, and by joining Charles they would gain the same *venia peccatorum* as those who fought for the redemption of the Holy Land.¹⁵

The old days of Urban IV had returned, and the Venetians at papal behest were to help restore to the Latin throne a French prince, who would recognize their erstwhile political and economic privileges as almost co-ordinate with his own imperial authority. In the bull of 10 March, 1307, Clement V repeated his earlier admonition that, if Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, Saracens, and other infidels, "qui assidue Andronicum prefatum impugnant," the Roman Church and all Christianity would be gravely imperiled.¹⁶ When on 3 June Clement excommunicated Andronicus II, "who calls himself emperor of the Greeks," the die was obviously cast. Constantinople loomed large in the minds of most advocates of the Crusade at this time, for the Latin reoccupation of the Bosphorus was widely regarded as the prime necessity for a successful expedition to the Holy Land:

¹⁴ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 27, pp. 48–53. Clement V and Charles of Valois also appealed to the Genoese, who had a large stake in Palaeologian Byzantium; their request for the commune's participation in the "crusade" was rejected (Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 204–8). But in 1307–1308 the Catalan Grand Company, which was then in Cassandrea and Macedonia, joined the Valois alliance, as did Stephen Uroš II of Serbia: neither was, however, in the least committed to Charles's so-called crusade (*ibid.*, pp. 208–11).

¹⁵ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, no. 1768, pp. 58–60; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 28, pp. 53–55; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, I, bk. 1, no. 308, p. 71. Clement V's letter of 10 March, 1307, was also addressed to all the archbishops and bishops *per districtum et provincias [venetas]*. Note also Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1306, nos. 2–5, vol. XXIII (Bar-le-Duc, 1871), pp. 374–76, and *cf.* nos. 12–13, pp. 379–81. Clement V also encouraged the Spanish crusaders against the Moslems in Granada (*ibid.*, ad ann. 1309, nos. 25 ff., vol. XXIII, pp. 443 ff.; ad ann. 1310, no. 44, pp. 467–68; and ad ann. 1312, no. 53, pp. 554–55).

¹⁶ *Reg. Clem. V*, no. 1768, pp. 58–59; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, 54 *cf.*, above, p. 96.

Pierre Dubois, Guillaume Adam, and Ramón Lull were not the only publicists who believed that the road to Jerusalem passed through Constantinople.¹⁷ About this time (on 5 September, 1307) Clement granted the Hospitallers in perpetuity the island of Rhodes, which they were busy seizing from the schismatic Greeks "not without great effort, outlay, and expense."¹⁸ Another base had thus been acquired for an eastern offensive, but in the meantime European attention was turned toward the prestigious figure of Charles of Valois.

The Venetians were not, however, wholly sold on Charles of Valois, who soon had explanations for his delay in getting the expedition started, protested against the proposed costs of transport in Venetian ships, and wanted certain modifications in the agreements he had negotiated with the Republic.¹⁹ They had

¹⁷ *Cf.* Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 676–81, with ample reference to the sources. Papal agents continued to collect the crusading tithe in Germany for the *negotium Terrae Sanctae* (*Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, nos. 1941–44, pp. 95–98). Latin propaganda had long since taken its toll of the Greeks' reputation. An unknown French writer of the year 1308 states: "Asia [Minor] . . . que est pars Grece continet in se dictas provincias [Bitiniam, Galaciam, Ysauriam, etc.], ab oriente circuncingitur Turcis, a septemtrione Tartaris et Ruthenis, ab occidente Bulgaris et Cumanis, a meridie Tracia. Terra est in omnibus habundans et fertilis in pane, vino, piscibus, carnibus, auro, argento, serico, sed homines illius terre sunt valde inbecilles et in nullo apti ad prelium et ideo reddunt tributum Turcis et Tartaris. Unde quia dictis Turcis nolebant reddere tributum, ab eisdem septimo anno transacto [counting inclusively and referring to the Ottoman defeat of a Byzantine army in the region of Bapheus, near Nicaea, on 27 July, 1302] tota terra dicta fuit devastata, depopulata et depauperata et ex hoc multum imperatoris Constantinopolitani diminuta potentia: homines incole dicti Christiani sunt, actamen scismatici perfidi" (Olgiard Górka, ed., *Anonymi descriptio Europae orientalis*, Cracow, 1916, pp. 6–7, and *cf.* pp. 23–25). Górka, *ibid.*, pp. XII–XIV, believes that the writer was a French Dominican. As is well known, Guillaume Adam, *De modo Sarracenos extirpandi*, in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Docs. arméniens*, II (Paris, 1906, and repr. 1967, 1969), 538–39, and "Brocardus," *Directorium ad passagium faciendum*, *ibid.*, II, 455, also emphasize the timidity of the Greeks: "Gentes enim grece miliciam perdiderunt, usum armorum nesciunt . . ." (p. 538), "inermes ut mulieres, timidi et pavidi . . ." (p. 455). Denigration of the Greeks as arrogant, slothful, perfidious, crafty, and timid had been a commonplace of the chroniclers and crusading propagandists from the 11th century, on which see Sibyll Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter: Studien zur Entwicklung der Idee eines lateinischen Kaiserreichs in Byzanz*, Zürich, 1969, esp. pp. 32 ff., 86 ff., 122 ff., 151 ff.

¹⁸ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, no. 2148, p. 134.

¹⁹ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 32, pp. 59–60, doc. dated at Poitou on 31 May, 1307.

as much reason for discontent with Clement V, who was interfering (unjustly in the Doge Gradenigo's opinion) in the ecclesiastical affairs of Crete.²⁰ That was not all. Papal condemnations of trading in arms and other *prohibita* with the Saracens, and especially with the Egyptians, had been directed at the doge and Signoria of Venice with particular point in 1304.²¹

The fact was that in early August, 1302, Venetian diplomats had finally secured an elaborate and singularly reassuring pact from the soldan of Egypt, an-Nāṣir Muḥammad, affirming in full detail the security of the persons and properties of all Venetian merchants everywhere in lands under Mamluk dominion. On land and sea they were to be safe and sound, free to come and go as they chose. They were to have as many warehouses in the Egyptian customs areas as they needed, well equipped and well roofed. Their goods were to be securely guarded, and the Venetians were to keep the keys to their own warehouses. Their consular rights were to be respected. Venetians who suffered shipwreck at Alexandria or elsewhere in Mamluk territory were assured "that our officials will send people to save and guard their belongings and persons, so that they may lose nothing." The property of a Venetian who died in the soldan's domain was to be disposed of according to his will: if he died intestate, his property was to be turned over to the Venetian consul. The Venetian colony in Alexandria was to have a market for storing and selling their wares, an oven, a fresh-water well, and certain other amenities and considerations to make life more tolerable and secure in a land where Europeans often felt unsafe and not infrequently contracted disease.²²

²⁰ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 30, 35–36, pp. 58, 62–63, docs. dated 29 May, 12 and 22 September, 1307; cf. no. 44, pp. 79–81, doc. from the year 1309, and *Reg. Clem. V*, annus secundus, no. 1654, pp. 30–31.

²¹ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 9–10, pp. 19–21, letters of Benedict XI, "considerantes . . . quod Saraceni Alexandria terreque Egipti non solum adversarii fidei . . . , sed etiam populi Christiani sunt hostes . . ." (p. 21). The *prohibita* included food, wine, and oil, as well as arms, horses, iron, and timber (*Reg. Clem. V*, annus tertius, no. 3218, pp. 232–34, addressed to the Venetians, Genoese, Anconitans, and others on 20 September, 1308).

²² Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 4, pp. 5–9, docs. dated 2 and 5 August, 1302, and cf. nos. 5–6, 12, 13 ff., 18. On Venetian relations with Egypt after the fall of Acre (in 1291), see Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, II (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Leipzig, 1923, Amsterdam, 1967), 37 ff. A pact with Tunis was also negotiated by a Venetian envoy on 3 August, 1305

Whatever the eventual complications, the Curia Romana could watch with equanimity Venetian efforts to make and maintain trading pacts with the kings of Cilician Armenia,²³ for after all they were Christians, but the Curia stood firm in its opposition to economic ties with the Moslems. Thus on 12 October, 1308, Clement V, who announced his intention of liberating the Holy Land (after Charles of Valois had won his late wife's Latin "empire" in Constantinople), threatened with excommunication all Christians who exported arms, horses, iron, timber, foodstuffs, and merchandise of any kind to Alexandria or any other place in Egypt.²⁴ The bull of October, 1308, was of course primarily a warning to the Venetians and their Genoese rivals. The Venetians obviously required some warning, for they were tiring of the complaints of Charles of Valois and the excuses he advanced from time to time to explain the failure of his expedition to get under way. On 6 July, 1309, Charles informed the doge and the Signoria that he had just spent many days at the Curia Romana, seeking a larger subsidy from his royal brother of France and from Clement V. He had enjoyed little success so far because of the *alia ardua et inevitabilia negotia*, which were engrossing the minds as well as the resources of both the king and the pope, but Charles was confident that the following February would see the expedition auspiciously under way, owing to the royal and papal assurances he had now received.²⁵

(*Dipl.*, I, no. 20, pp. 33–38), and shortly afterwards merchants of the Republic received a *privilegium* from the Mongol il-khan of Persia (*ibid.*, I, no. 26, p. 47), on which see Heyd, *op. cit.*, II, 122–24.

The Catalans were also active in Egypt. At least eight embassies were exchanged between Barcelona and Cairo from 1300 to 1330. James II and Alfonso IV sought from an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, one of the greatest soldans, the grant of commercial privileges for Catalan merchants, unrestrained access by Christian pilgrims to the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, the opening of the Coptic churches in Cairo, and the release of the Christian captives taken by the Mamluks from time to time, on which see the interesting little monograph by A. S. Atiya, *Egypt and Aragon*, Leipzig, 1938, repr. Liechtenstein, 1966 (in the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXIII-7).

²³ Cf. Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 29, 31, 37–38, 40, and 47, pp. 55 ff.

²⁴ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 39, pp. 74–75; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, I, bk. 1, no. 381, p. 89. Traffic in contraband did not cease, of course, and Clement V indignantly returned to the subject (*Reg. Clem. V*, annus sextus, nos. 7118–19, pp. 241–42, dated 17 July, 1311).

²⁵ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 41, pp. 75–76. Among the "arduous" problems facing Clement V were the affair of

The Doge Pietro Gradenigo clearly permitted himself to entertain some doubt on that score, when on 10 September, 1309, he wrote Clement V, with reference to this new postponement of the Franco-Venetian expedition against Constantinople, that the Venetians had long wanted to recover their part of the Latin empire (*supradicti imperii pars nostra*) and of course to see the Church of Constantinople rescued from schism and restored to the universal Roman Church. To this end they had made an alliance with Charles of Valois, who had been failing in his stated obligations to the Republic. The Venetians were incurring expenses and facing perils in the East. Now Charles was putting off the expedition again, and Clement had intervened on his behalf. The doge would not conceal from his Holiness the intolerable burden this dilatory policy imposed upon the Venetians and the grievous loss of time they were suffering. But so great was the devotion which the Doge and the Signoria felt for the pope and the Apostolic See that Venice would of course accept the postponement of the expedition until February, 1310.²⁶

the Templars, the alleged heresy of his predecessor Boniface VIII, the Catalan-Aragonese efforts to take the Moslem kingdom of Granada, and the forthcoming council to be held at Vienne.

²⁶ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 42, pp. 76–78. According to the *Fragmentum* of Marino Sanudo, ed. R. L. Wolff, "Hopf's So-Called 'Fragmentum' . . .," in *The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume*, New York, 1953, p. 153, Charles of Valois gave up the intention of going on the crusade upon the death in October, 1307, of his wife Catherine, "to whom the right of the empire of Romania belonged" (but obviously he did nothing of the sort): "Mortua vero domina Katerina, uxore . . . Karoli . . ., cui ius imperii Romanie spectabat, dictus dominus Karolus illam intentionem dimisit, itaque huc usque res absque fine perfectio remansit." The reading of this passage in Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 173 (" . . . illam in Franciam dimisit . . .") suggests that Charles sent his wife's body to France, which is certainly less relevant to the passage than the statement that he now abandoned his plans for the reconquest of Constantinople, which observation Sanudo makes elsewhere, in much the same words, in a well-known letter (F. Kunsmann, "Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren . . .," *Abhandlungen der historischen Classe d. k. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, VII [Munich, 1855], ep. II, p. 775): "Demum mortua est uxor domini Caroli, domina Caterina, filia quondam imperatoris Philippi [de Courtenay], ad quam spectabat imperium. Unde predictus magnificus dominus Carolus reliquit intentionem illam de acquirendo imperium." Hopf's text of the *Fragmentum* of Sanudo is based upon the MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds français 4792 (formerly 9644), which Du Cange and Buchon had published before him; Wolff's text follows the Bodleian MS., Laud. Misc. 587, which provides some better readings. Both MSS.

In the meantime (on 22 October, 1309) Clement cautioned Philip IV of France that it behooved the honor of the royal house to continue working for the crusade *ad effectum debitum*. Both Philip and Charles of Valois had been granted tithes on the revenues of ecclesiastical properties in France, but that granted to Charles was now to be collected first since even Philip was apparently prepared to acknowledge that his brother's proposed expedition to the East had reached a critical impasse.²⁷ Charles of Valois lacked the manhood, however, as well as the means necessary for such an expedition; the patience of the Venetians was exhausted, and they decided to make peace with the Byzantine government.

The terms of a truce were prepared in the doge's palace on 3 October, 1310; Andronicus II accepted and confirmed them in the palace of Blachernae on 11 November. The truce was intended to last for twelve years (to be reckoned from 14 August, 1310), and Andronicus agreed to make an annual payment to Venice of 10,000 gold hyperpyra for four years, the full sum of 40,000 hyperpyra constituting complete satisfaction of all claims which the doge and citizens of the Republic might have upon the imperial government, which was, however, to make no claim upon the Venetians for losses which the Greeks had suffered through the years of hostility. The high contracting parties were to give each other six months' notice in the event that either wished to terminate the truce after the expiration of the twelve-year period. The Venetians were not to export scarce grain (costing more than one hyperpyron per modium) from Byzantine territory nor render any kind of assistance to the Catalan Grand Company,

are of the later fourteenth century, and both contain Villehardouin's *Conquête de Constantinople*, as a supplement to which Wolff believes that Sanudo intended the "Fragmentum."

Among the expenditures *pro vestibus, pannis et forraturis* published by K. H. Schäfer from the Vatican registers of Introitus et Exitus for 1322 appears the interesting fact that on 26 July "de mandato pape mandantis nobis per nobilem virum P. de Via [a nephew of John XXII], quod daremus vestes d. Marino Sanudo alias dicto Torcello de Venetiis, qui libros super informatione passagii Terre Sancte portaverat domino nostro, pro vestibus yeme prox. preterita de 3 garnimentis, videl. supertunicali, tunica et mantica emptis pro eo a Lapo de Pistorio, mercatore curie Romane, de panno marbrino de Melinis, in quo fuerunt 5 canne 2 palmi: 18 fl. 5 s. 6 d. tur. p." (*Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII. nebst den Jahresbilanzen von 1316–1375*, Paderborn, 1911, p. 215).

²⁷ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 43, pp. 78–79, with a quoted addendum from [Chas.] du Fresne Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople*.

the *Compagna Almugavarorum*, which had been nominally in the service of Charles of Valois for more than two years (1307–1310).²⁸ Actually and ironically the attacks of the Catalan Grand Company upon Byzantine territory during the years which followed the murder of their leader Roger de Flor in April, 1305, were the closest thing to a crusade which Europeans managed to organize against Andronicus II.²⁹

Throughout this period France, always France, was the predominant influence at the Curia. Of 134 cardinals created by the seven Avignonese popes from Clement V to Gregory XI, one was Genevan, two English, five Spanish, fourteen Italian, and 112 French. No German received a red hat. Of the French, ninety-five were natives of the Midi, including forty-eight compatriots of the popes who appointed them; sixteen came from the north of France, and one from the Comtat-Venaissin. Among the cardinals from the Midi, Gascony, Quercy, and Limousin were well represented: in the early years of the Avignonese papacy a Gascon faction was strong; John XXII appointed eight Quercynois; and from the reign of Clement VI the Limousins tended to predominate in the consistory.³⁰ Whatever the differences between cardinals of the *langue d'Oc* and those of the *langue d'Oïl*, or the rivalries among the various factions in the Sacred College, Avignonese policy was always strongly inclined toward France, to the frequent annoyance of the English king and the more frequent indignation of the English parliament.

²⁸ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 45–46, pp. 82–85, docs. dated 3 October and 11 November, 1310.

²⁹ Cf. Marino Sanudo's so-called *Fragmentum*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes* (1873), p. 173; Antoni Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947, docs. XIV ff., XXXIV ff., pp. 15 ff., 42 ff.; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 295 ff.; R. Ignatius Burns, "The Catalan Company and the European Powers, 1305–1311," *Speculum*, XXIX (1954), 751–71; David Jacoby, "La 'Compagnie Catalane' et l'état catalan de Grèce . . .," *Journal des Savants*, 1966, pp. 78 ff.; and Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, esp. chaps. v–vii.

³⁰ See Bernard Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon (1309–1376): Étude d'une société*, Paris, 1962, pp. 183–89, 701 (in the Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, no. 201), and cf. Guillaume Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon (1305–1378)*, 9th ed., Paris, 1949, pp. 476–77, who however counted 13 Italians and 113 French. Our fullest accounts of the Avignonese papacy may now be found in Guillemain's book and that of Yves Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378*, Paris, 1941 (also in the Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, no. 151).

The cardinals' households were elaborate, their incomes immense. In addition to their numerous benefices, gifts, and other avails, Nicholas IV had granted them on 18 July, 1289, the right to "participate" in one-half the entire regular income accruing to the Holy See from Sicily, England, "and any other kingdoms" [paying homage to the pope], Sardinia, Corsica, Benevento, the March of Ancona, the Romagna, the duchy of Spoleto, the Patrimony of S. Peter in Tuscany, the Campagna and the Marittima, the Comtat-Venaissin (around Avignon), and elsewhere. The cardinals shared equally in the proceeds.³¹

In the early fourteenth century the attention of Europe and the Holy See was fastened for years upon the trial of the Knights Templars. Since the fall of Acre in 1291 the Templars had been held in less esteem than the Knights Hospitallers, whose "hospitality" (*hospitalitas*) and care of the sick had always accompanied their function as warriors in the Holy Land. The grand master of the Templars, Jacques de Molay, wrote Clement V (probably late in the year 1306) that, although the Templars were founded chiefly for military service, they dispensed alms three times a week, and always gave the poor a tithe of all their bread.³²

But Guillaume de Nogaret, Guillaume de Plaisians, and Pierre Dubois turned the full force of the French propaganda machine upon the Templars, whom King Philip IV apparently hated for reasons that are still not clear. The king collected evidence against them for about two years before ordering their mass arrest everywhere in France (on 13 October, 1307), and Clement V's timidity involved the Holy See in the wretched business of the torture, the condemnation, and in many cases the execution of men who were largely innocent of the vicious (and sometimes absurd) charges made against them.³³ By his own account Jacques de Molay did not have four cents to defend himself or

³¹ Augustin Theiner, ed., *Codex diplomaticus domini temporalis S. Sedis*, I (Rome, 1861, repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1964), no. 468, pp. 304–5: ". . . statuimus et decernimus . . . ut de universis fructibus, redditibus, proventibus, multis, condemnationibus et censibus . . . fiat divisio in duas partes, quarum una papali camere semper cedit, reliqua vero inter cardinales eosdem equaliter dividatur. . . ."

³² Georges Lizerand, *Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers*, Paris, 1923, p. 6.

³³ On the charges, see Lizerand, *Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers*, pp. 18, 26, 28, 30 ff., 40, 104, 122, 160, 168, 194.

the Order.³⁴ Thirty-six Templars died under torture at Paris, and fifty-four others were burned at the stake.³⁵

The Council of Vienne was summoned to witness the demise of the Order, whose suppression the pope announced on 3 April, 1312, before the conciliar fathers, who had been given no voice in the proceedings. On 24 August, Philip IV approved the papal transfer of the Templars' possessions to the Hospitallers, provided the latter were reformed "in head and members," and became worthy instruments for the recovery of the Holy Land (*subsidio Terre Sancte*).³⁶ Nevertheless, Philip himself had done nothing to create an atmosphere favorable to the crusade.

Although Clement V proclaimed the crusade "contra Sarracenos regni Granate," and granted to the Catalans and Castilians who fought for the destruction of the Moorish kingdom of Granada the same indulgences as to those who fought for the recovery of the Holy Land,³⁷ there were too many distractions in Italy to turn the arms of the faithful against the Moslem powers in the Levant. In fact Venice and the Holy See were at war from October, 1308, to March, 1310, when the Republic was trying to extend her sway over Ferrara and the Po valley. Clement showed a determination (unusual for him) to reassert the old papal suzerainty over Ferrara, and succeeded in doing so, but the harsh and incompetent administration of the papal vicar-general forced Clement to turn Ferrara over to the still worse vicariate of King Robert of Naples (late in the year 1312). Robert's garrison of Catalan mercenaries was ousted in August, 1317, when the Ferrarese themselves restored the Estensi to power.³⁸ During these years, of course, there

was not the slightest chance of co-operation between Venice and the Holy See to send a crusading expedition to the Levant.

The contest between Venice and the Curia Romana, however, was far from being the worst disturbance in Italy. Almost every imperial descent into the peninsula caused turmoil. Countless troubles attended Henry VII's southern expedition to secure his imperial coronation, which took place at S. John's Lateran on 29 June, 1312. Rome became an armed camp with the various quarters of the city almost equally divided behind barricades erected by the Guelfs and Ghibellines. The troops of King Robert of Naples, commanded by his young brother John of Gravina (later prince of Achaëa) and aided by their Guelf allies, had prevented Henry's being crowned in S. Peter's, which Clement V had prescribed as the place for the ceremony. Henry regarded Robert as the worst of his numerous Italian enemies, and was determined to crush him. He formed an alliance of the German empire with the island kingdom of Sicily (*Trinacria*) whose sovereign, Frederick of Aragon-Catalonia, gladly agreed to the betrothal of his son Peter to Henry's daughter, Beatrice of Luxemburg. But as Frederick began an invasion of the Neapolitan kingdom, at Henry's behest and in defiance of Pope Clement's prohibition, Henry died suddenly at Buonconvento south of Siena (on 24 August, 1313). Frederick retired to his island fastness to await a more opportune time to attack the Angevins.³⁹

³⁴ Lizerand, *Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers*, p. 148: "... cum esset in captivitate dominorum pape et regis nec haberet aliquid, eciam quattuor denarios, quos expendere posset pro predicta defensione. . . ."

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 156, 190, and see in general Heinrich Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, 2 vols., Münster i.W., 1907 (the second volume contains 158 documents), and Georges Lizerand, *Clément V et Philippe IV le Bel*, Paris, 1910.

³⁶ Lizerand, *Le Dossier de l'affaire des Templiers*, pp. 200, 202.

³⁷ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus quartus, nos. 5090-95, pp. 469-76, dated 12 November, 1309, and no. 6312, pp. 410-11, dated 23 May, 1310.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, annus quartus, nos. 5000-1, pp. 426-30, dated 4 December, 1308, and nos. 5081-85, pp. 459-67, dated 28 June, 1309; no. 5087, p. 468, dated 17 July, 1309; annus

quintus, nos. 6316-17, pp. 412-27, dated 11 February and 21 May, 1310; annus septimus, no. 8748, pp. 289-90, dated 25 November, 1311; annus octavus, nos. 9007-11, pp. 46-89, papal letters of 26 January and 17 February, 1313, confirming the pacts between the Ferrarese and Venetians and restoring the Venetian clergy to the benefices of which they had been deprived. Guillaume de Bruniquel was appointed Clement's vicar-general in *temporalibus* on 21 May, 1310 (*ibid.*, annus quintus, nos. 6313-14, 6317, pp. 411-12, 425-27), and by 26 November, 1311, his rapacity and that of his underlings had come under investigation (*ibid.*, annus septimus, no. 8749, p. 291). See in general the scholarly study of Giovanni Soranzo, *La Guerra fra Venezia e la S. Sede per il dominio di Ferrara (1308-1313)*, Città di Castello, 1905, with an appendix of twenty-three documents, and Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (1949), pp. 141-48.

³⁹ Cf. the contemporary narrative of Nicholas of Butrinto, "Relatio de itinere italico Henrici VII imperatoris," in Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914-22, III, 491-561, and W. M. Bowsky, *Henry VII in Italy: The Conflict of Empire and City-State*, Lincoln, 1960.

The dying Clement now decided to take precautions against further imperial interference in Neapolitan affairs, and by the decretals *Romani principes* and *Pastoralis cura* (of 14 and 19 March, 1314) he attacked the late Henry as dishonestly denying that the oaths which he and his imperial predecessors had taken to the pope and the Holy See were in fact *iuramenta fidelitatis*, with the clear implication of vassalage.⁴⁰ Clement stated that Robert was not an imperial vassal for the kingdom of Naples (*regnum scilicet Siciliae*), and that he had not been guilty of *laesa maiestas* against Henry, who had denounced Robert as a "rebel, traitor, and enemy of the empire." Robert's kingdom was a papal fief, and he was the liege and vassal of the Holy See. Clement declared null and void the ban and penalties which Henry had sought to impose upon Robert, and he did this by virtue of the superiority of the papacy over the empire, by the imperial authority which as supreme pontiff it was his right to wield during an interregnum, and by the *plenitudo potestatis* which Christ had bestowed upon his vicar in the person of S. Peter.⁴¹

The presence of the emperor in Italy caused more unrest than the absence of the pope. But to be crowned in Rome seemed almost imperative to the successors of Charlemagne and the Ottos, and indeed without this coronation they were only kings of the Romans and not emperors. In October, 1314, disputed elections provided both Ludwig of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria with claims to succeed Henry VII; Ludwig received the votes of most of the

electors and gradually won out over his Hapsburg rival, who died before him. The Bavarian's stormy tenure of the imperial office involved him in a long struggle with John XXII, who adhered to the principles laid down by Clement V in the decretal *Pastoralis cura*. The contest was marked by the most vigorous pamphleteering on the part of both imperialists and papalists.

Ludwig found some support for his opposition to John XXII in the radical arguments against the temporal power of the papacy advanced by Marsiglio of Padua and John of Jandun in the *Defensor pacis*, which (at whatever date they began the work) was finished in June, 1324. After the fashion of the Averroist Aristotelians of their day, Marsiglio and John separated human from divine law, reason from faith, and mundane society from the future life. Lowering their sights from heaven to earth, they recognized the clergy as an important class in society like agriculturists, merchants, and artisans, but the priest no less than the artisan was subject in this life to secular law and to secular authority, and the pope had no just claim to either spiritual or temporal supremacy.⁴² A motley crowd of hard-headed imperialists and light-headed visionaries took up the cudgels against the Avignonese popes, who found champions in such writers as the German Carmelite Sybert of Beek, the energetic Augustinian Guglielmo Amidani of Cremona, a certain Petrus de Lutra, the Franciscans Andrea da Perugia and Francesco Toti, the strange Pavian Opicinus de Canistris, the canonist Hermann of Schildesche (near Bielefeld in Westphalia), Lambert Guerrici of Huy (in the diocese of Liège), and various others, who by and large wielded the pen with more zeal than talent.⁴³

⁴⁰ *Clementinae*, lib. II, tit. IX, eds. E. L. Richter and Emil Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici*, II (Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1955), cols. 1147-50, *Romani principes*.

⁴¹ *Clem.*, lib. II, tit. XI, cap. II, *ibid.*, II, cols. 1151-53, *Pastoralis cura*: ". . . nos tam ex superioritate, quam ad imperium non est dubium nos habere, quam ex potestate in qua vacante imperio imperatori succedimus, et nihilominus ex illius plenitudine potestatis quam Christus . . . nobis . . . in persona beati Petri concessit, sententiam et processus omnes praedictos [pronounced by Henry VII against Robert of Naples] . . . de fratrum nostrorum consilio declaramus fuisse ac esse omnino irritos et inanes. . . ." See G. Lizerand, "Les Constitutions *Romani principes* et *Pastoralis cura* et leurs sources," *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, XXXVII (1913), 725-57, who explores the juridical background of both decretals. The text of *Pastoralis cura* was promulgated in a public consistory at Monteuix on 14 March, 1314 (at the same time as *Romani principes*), and was repeated on the nineteenth in a public "audience." Cf. in general Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, pp. 318-29, who misdates the decretals (p. 328).

⁴² Marsiglio's views are too well known for further elaboration here. The main purpose of the *Defensor pacis* was the annihilation of the papacy (note esp. dictio II, capp. XV-XXVI, ed. C. W. Previté-Orton, Cambridge, 1928, pp. 263 ff., and ed. Richard Scholz, 2 fascs., Hanover, 1932-33, pp. 325 ff.).

⁴³ Richard Scholz, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327-1354): Analysen und Texte*, 2 vols., Rome, 1911-1914 (Bibliothek des Kgl. Preuss. Historischen Instituts in Rom, vols. IX-X); note also Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* (1962), pp. 90-96, with refs., and on Opicinus de Canistris, who became a scribe in the Penitentiary, see, *ibid.*, pp. 343-44, and Richard Salomon, *Opicinus de Canistris: Weltbild und Bekenntnisse eines avignonesischen Klerikers des 14. Jahrhunderts*, London and Leipzig, 1936, esp. pp. 23 ff.

Over the years Ludwig harbored the Franciscan malcontents who were offended by John XXII's condemnation of clerical poverty, and Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia of Bergamo, and William of Ockham all died in Munich. Ockham was primarily a theologian rather than a political theorist, and the weight of his attacks upon papal absolutism was for that very reason the more heavily felt at Avignon, where his far-reaching influence was most disturbing to the Curia. He inveighed against the tyranny of the papacy in both church and state, and stood out as an uncompromising defender of the emperor and the empire, roundly denying the papal claims to the "plenitude of power."⁴⁴

Like Henry VII before him, Ludwig of Bavaria also took the road to Italy, where he remained for some three years (1327–1330), and where he was twice crowned in Rome (at S. Peter's on 17 January and 22 May, 1328) in ceremonies of dubious ecclesiastical validity. He secured the schismatic election of a Franciscan, a very minor friar named Pietro Rainalducci da Corbara, as Pope Nicholas V (on 12 May, 1328), but the anti-pope's position became untenable when Ludwig withdrew into northern Italy. Pietro da Corbara abdicated at Pisa in July, 1330, and died in comfortable confinement at Avignon.⁴⁵

As Ludwig of Bavaria left the stage, King John of Bohemia came to the forefront in northern Italy, where he almost put together a state. John's ambition was frustrated, however, by a north Italian league formed at Ferrara in September, 1332, when Guelfs and Ghibellines joined together lest the adventurous king should gain another kingdom with

the connivance of John XXII and the papal legate, Cardinal Bertrand du Poujet. John of Bohemia failed, and papal efforts to achieve some sort of hegemony in Lombardy, the March of Ancona, the Romagna, and Emilia failed also, for the legate Bertrand du Poujet added bad luck to bad judgment, and the Italian *signori* and *signorie* were determined to maintain their independence.

It was the age of despots. The Visconti were ruling in Milan, the Scaligeri in Verona, the Montefeltri in Urbino. The Bonaccolsi had just fallen in Mantua, to be sure, and death had recently removed Castruccio Castracani from the lordship of Lucca (in 1328), but Lodovico Gonzaga, who had snatched Mantua from Passerino Bonaccolsi, was founding a dynasty that was to last for three centuries. Besides the Este in Ferrara, the Manfredi held sway at Imola and Faenza in the Romagna, the Polenta at Ravenna, the Malatesta at Rimini, and the Ordelaffi at Forlì. Some of these families retained their authority into the sixteenth century, sometimes the allies but usually the opponents of the Holy See, which had perforce to recognize them as "vicars" in control of allegedly papal cities.

The hostile interference of Philip VI of France and Robert of Naples frustrated the efforts of Ludwig of Bavaria to make amends for his attacks upon the papacy and to effect a reconciliation with Benedict XII who, when he succeeded John XXII in 1334, would have much preferred peace to discord. Benedict was building the massive northeastern wings of the palace at Avignon; it was a better use for money, he thought, than warring with the Ghibellines in Italy. Clement VI followed him in 1342, and added the southwestern wings to the palace, but was less cautious than Benedict, reverted to the intransigent policy of John XXII against the Wittelsbachs, and declared Ludwig's deposition from the imperial throne.

At Rense on 11 July, 1346, John of Bohemia's son was elected king of the Romans as Charles IV (and John lost his life the following month on the battlefield at Crécy). Ludwig of Bavaria himself died on a bear hunt in October, 1347; after the passing of another rival in 1349, Charles IV's authority was recognized. He made the usual expedition into Italy, and was crowned at Rome (on 5 April, 1355), after which he returned to Germany to publish the Golden Bull of 1356, which disregarded the

⁴⁴ Richard Scholz, *Wilhelm von Ockham als politischer Denker und sein Breviloquium de principatu tyrannico*, Leipzig, 1944 (Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde [Monumenta Germaniae historica], no. 8). In arguing the pope's illegitimate usurpation of power, Ockham states "quod ad pape non spectat officium se negotiis secularibus implicare, ex quo patenter concluditur quod papa non habet in secularibus seu temporalibus talem plenitudinem potestatis" (*ibid.*, p. 66, *et alibi*). On Ockham's works, see Scholz, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, I, 141 ff., and II, 346–480, and L. Baudry, *Guillaume d'Occam: Sa vie, ses oeuvres, ses idées sociales et politiques*, vol. I: *L'Homme et les oeuvres*, Paris, 1950.

⁴⁵ Cf. Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I 143–51, 167, with an indication of sources in vol. II, 196–210, and note Walter Hofmann's brief but learned sketch of German opposition to the Avignonese papacy in "Antikuriale Bewegungen in Deutschland in der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1314–1346)," *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, XXXV (Berlin, 1961), 79–82.

papal claims of *Pastoralis cura*,⁴⁶ and settled the question of election to the German throne by confirming the electoral rights of the archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne, and those of the king of Bohemia, the count palatine of the Rhine, the duke of Saxony-Wittenberg, and the margrave of Brandenburg—three ecclesiastical and four lay electors, who became almost sovereign in their domains, and who alone created kings of the Romans. Innocent VI apparently made no protest at the exclusion of the Holy See from the very basis of a new imperial constitution. He saw no point in continuing against the Luxemburgers the costly struggle which his predecessors had carried on against the Wittelsbachs. Thus the Golden Bull set the imperial electoral procedure which lasted until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The fourteenth century was a period of violent social change as well as intellectual ferment. The widespread famine in Europe for three successive years (1315–1317), the revolt of the peasants and weavers in western Flanders (1323–1328), the dramatic bank failures in Florence (1343–1346), the Black Death with its consequent labor shortages and high prices, the Jacquerie in France (1358), the Lollard movement in England and the Peasants' Revolt (1381), and the intermittent but prolonged distraction (and destruction) of the Hundred Years' War were hardly conducive to the Crusade. The papacy spent immense sums on the Italian wars, but despite the remarkable success of Bertrand du Poujet's great successor, Cardinal Gil de Albornoz (1353–1357, 1358–1363),⁴⁷ Gregory XI's return to Rome was

attended by turmoil in Italy, the massacre at Cesena (1377), and the War of the Eight Saints (1376–1378).⁴⁸

The Spiritual Franciscans, or what was left of them, had continued to assail papal authority, and John Wyclif joined the fray with attacks upon the priesthood as well as the hierarchy. The Church was, he contended, the union of all true Christians; it had been debased by a corrupt clergy and a grasping papacy. Wyclif would deny the clergy the right to possess property; he rejected most of the sacramental system; and he extolled the power of the king and the magnates over that of the pope and the priests, who in his view were not entitled to exercise any coercive power at all.⁴⁹ Wyclif's teachings became well known, and struck responsive chords among the people in England, Bohemia, and elsewhere.

There was ample cause for complaint. Nicole Oresme had seen trouble coming. In a sermon which he preached to Urban V and the cardinals on Christmas eve of 1363 (and which became very popular, finding its way into print in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), Oresme acknowledged the fatuity of much preaching on Christ's poverty. He also stated that priests lived better than the common people in all societies, which was quite fitting; this did not justify, however, the pomp of "horse and household" that marked the lives of great prelates. The shepherds were not feeding their

⁴⁶ Conrad of Megenberg, *Tractatus contra Wilhelmum Occam* (dedicated to Charles IV on 28 September, 1354), ed. R. Scholz, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, II, 352, discusses the two decretals *Romani principes* and *Pastoralis cura*, "per que duo statuta iura imperii et totum imperium annihilantur et destruuntur."

⁴⁷ On the difficulties of the Holy See in central Italy, see M. Antonelli, "Vicende della dominazione pontificia nel patrimonio di S. Pietro in Tuscia dalla traslazione della Sede alla restaurazione dell' Albornoz," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXV (1902), 355–95; XXVI (1903), 249–341; and XXVII (1904), 109–46, 313–49, with twenty-two papal letters and one other document (1318–1357), and note also Giovanni Tabacco, "La Tradizione guelfa in Italia durante il pontificato di Benedetto XII," in P. Vaccari and P. F. Palumbo, eds., *Studi di storia medievale e moderna in onore di Ettore Rota*, Rome, 1958, pp. 97–148. On the catastrophes of the age, note Josiah C. Russell, "Effects of Pestilence and Plague," *Comparative Studies*

in *Society and History*, VIII (The Hague, 1966), 464–73. The rural population of Tuscany had been declining for decades before the Black Death (cf., David Herlihy, "Population, Plague, and Social Change in Rural Pistoia, 1201–1430," *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., XVIII [1965], 225–44).

⁴⁸ See in general M. Antonelli, "La Dominazione pontificia nel Patrimonio negli ultimi venti anni del periodo avignonese," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXX (1907), 269–332, and XXXI (1908), 121–68, 315–55, with twenty-four documents (1363–1378). Cf. Pierre Ronzy, *Le Voyage de Grégoire XI ramenant la papauté d'Avignon à Rome (1376–1377)*, Florence, 1952, who has edited the tedious but instructive poem of Pierre Ameilh (or Ameil) on the *Itinerarium Gregorii XI*. Ameilh served as papal librarian from 1366 to 1395 under Urban V, Gregory XI, Urban VI, and Boniface IX. On conditions in Rome in 1376–1378, note R. C. Trexler, "Rome on the Eve of the Great Schism," *Speculum*, XLII (1967), 489–509.

⁴⁹ Wyclif's treatise *De potestate pape* was written in 1379, and makes frequent reference to the beginning Schism as Urban VI and Clement VII declared each other excommunicate—to the immense satisfaction of Wyclif, who identified unworthy and false popes with the Antichrist (Johann Loserth, ed., *Johannis Wyclif tractatus de potestate pape*, London, 1907, repr. New York, 1966, chaps. 6–8, 9–10, 12, esp. pp. 118–26, 144, 148–50, 185–90, 221–22, 233–34, 248, 251 ff., 321 ff., 352–54, 386 ff.).

sheep. They were feeding themselves. But even among priests a scandalous inequality existed. While one suffered from starvation, another suffered from indigestion. Reprehensible prelates were an old story, and in times past conditions in the Church had been worse than in Oresme's day (*etiam plus quam nunc*), but he added, "I do not see that, if a house has been ready to collapse for some time, it is for this reason any less likely to fall or any less dangerous!"⁵⁰

Sometimes the Crusade seemed almost forgotten at Avignon, but the popes remained dedicated to the idea, and for good reason. If the kings and chivalry of France and England could be persuaded to go crusading, drawing off the grand companies of mercenaries that were ruining France, the Holy Sepulcher would be won, and there would be no one to carry on the Hundred Years' War, which was taking a grievous toll of churches, monasteries, hospitals, schools, and human life in France. Towns were sacked and burned; houses and vineyards were destroyed; land went out of cultivation; lay and ecclesiastical revenues declined. Food shortages and the plague followed the armies over wide areas in France.⁵¹

Despite this devastation, however, and partly because of it, ecclesiastical circles were flooded with crusading propaganda. Theorists proposed the naval blockade of Mamluk Egypt and the strict prohibition of Christian trade with the soldan's subjects at Alexandria. Until the Osmanlis occupied Adrianople, Egypt was generally looked upon as the great Moslem power; in any event the soldan's forces held Syria and Palestine. Crusading schemes were put forward by Fidenzio of Padua and the indefatigable Ramón Lull; the French publicists Pierre Dubois, Guillaume de Nogaret, and Guillaume Adam; the Armenian prince Hayton and the Venetian traveler Marino Sanudo Torsello. The fourteenth century produced, however, not only crusading propa-

gandists but also loyal adherents to the ideal like Pierre Thomas and Philippe de Mézières, who were willing to risk their lives for the recovery of the Holy Land. It also produced some notable crusades, large-scale military expeditions into the Levant, which although limited in results were certainly spectacular in performance.⁵²

The diplomatic correspondence of the Avignonese period sheds much light on the difficulties attending papal elections, factional strife among the cardinals, meetings of the consistory, local intrigue and international tensions, and the activities and personalities of the leading cardinals. For the reigns of Clement V and John XXII such matters are often vividly depicted in the letters and other documents published in Heinrich Finke's *Acta Aragonensia*. Fifteen cardinals, of whom twelve were Italians, took part in the election of Clement V in June, 1305; in three promotions (in 1305, 1310, and 1312), however, Clement named twenty-four cardinals, of whom thirteen were Gascons; and thereafter the Italian influence in the Sacred College diminished rapidly. For some time the proud figure of Cardinal Napoleone Orsini loomed large. A Roman, he was a member of the College for fifty-four years (from May, 1288, to March, 1342). As a cardinal, he served under seven popes. He made his own policy; his decisions in the conclave helped to elect both Clement V and John XXII; but of course the tiara lay far beyond his grasp, for the conclaves always contained too many cardinals from the Midi.⁵³

The ever-increasing French ascendancy in the College finally reduced Napoleone and the other Italian cardinals to an impotence which they could relieve only by intriguing against the pope or by trying to oppose him in the consistory. Thus on Monday, 3 October, 1323, as John XXII turned his attention from

⁵⁰ *Sermo coram papa Urbano V et cardinalibus habitus, cuius thema: "Juxta est salus mea ut veniat, et justitia mea ut reveletur,"* summarized with selections from the text in Francis Meunier, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Nicole Oresme*, Paris, 1857, pp. 40-44.

⁵¹ H. Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la désolation des églises, monastères et hôpitaux en France*, II (Paris, 1899, repr. Brussels, 1965), covers the depredation in France to the death of Charles V (1380). Denifle's first volume (1897, repr. 1965) contains more than a thousand documents (or *regesta* of documents) from the first half of the fifteenth century.

⁵² Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle* (1886), I, 16-39, 48-77, 80-98; N. Jorga [Iorga], *Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1896; A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1938, pp. 29 ff.; Joachim Smet, *The Life of Saint Peter Thomas by Philippe de Mézières*, Rome, 1954; and F. J. Boehlke, Jr., *Pierre de Thomas: Scholar, Diplomat, and Crusader*, Philadelphia, 1966.

⁵³ Cf. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I (1908), introd., pp. CLXVI ff.; Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I (1913, repr. 1960), II, on Napoleone Orsini, and see, *ibid.*, pp. 13-15, for Clement V's three promotions.

the Crusade (for which Charles IV of France had just demanded huge subventions in men and money), he announced in the consistory that he intended to depose Ludwig of Bavaria, "who calls himself king of Germany," and who was a fautor of heretics. The cardinals were all astonished, and none dared to reply, "saving Messer Napoleone [Orsini] and Messer Pietro Colonna and Messer Giacomo Caetani, and they said that the result would be a great scandal, and nothing but a return to the war between the Empire and the Church." The pope was incensed, especially against Pietro Colonna, who stood up to him. On Wednesday, the fifth, there was another meeting of the consistory, and the three Italian cardinals again refused to give way, but two days later they told John that he might do as he pleased. When on Saturday, the eighth, the "process" against Ludwig was finally read, however harsh it may have sounded to partisans of the empire, it was a good deal less so than the irate pope had at first wanted it.⁵⁴ But the dissident Italian cardinals still withheld their consent.⁵⁵ Although the distribution of so many red hats among the south French changed the political concerns as well as the social complexion of the College, the Crusade still remained a subject of discussion, which (as we shall see) finally reached a point of decisive action during the decade of Clement VI's reign.

The texts published by Finke from the Archives of the Crown of Aragon (Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó) in Barcelona enable us to walk the dirty, crowded streets of Avignon throughout the first quarter of the fourteenth century. The Archives contain some 6,389 volumes (or "registers"), with about 3,194,500 documents, dating very largely from the middle ages; 338 volumes, with more than 300,000 documents, have survived from the reign of King James II (1291–1327), whose envoys kept him well informed concerning conditions and events in Avignon. Their letters are an invaluable source for the social history of both the city and the Curia. Thus in October, 1316, Pons de Gualba, bishop of Barcelona (1303–1334), and Vidal de

Villanova, one of the best-known diplomats of his time, arrived in Avignon on an important mission for James II, and on the seventeenth they sent the king their first report. There was talk of a crusade, they wrote, and apparently some slight progress in organizing one. Some knights had taken the cross for service overseas "as a sign of penance." The pope was bearing down on the cardinals' ostentatious way of life, and had limited the numbers of their squires (*scutiferi*), attendants, and chaplains. Their hitherto elaborate dinners were to be a thing of the past; henceforth they were not to serve more than two courses (*fercula*) at a meal.⁵⁶ Non-curial prelates were to return to their own sees when their business in Avignon was finished. Otherwise there seemed to be little or nothing new at the Curia.

Avignon itself was a horror. The two envoys were miserably housed in public inns, "owing to the great pressure of people." The streets were full of mud; the stench was unbearable. In fact their lodgings stank, and were a peril to health; it was also degrading to his Majesty that a Catalan embassy should be so badly housed; and so they were moving across the Rhone to the suburb of S. André (where the later fort was built on the hilltop) in Villeneuve-lès-Avignon (in French territory). Their dignity was thus protected, and their health better assured, with the river between them and the *fetida civitas*. It was easy for them to go over the Pont S. Bénézet, which connected S. André with Avignon, and so be in daily attendance at the papal court. Despite their precautions Vidal became ill.⁵⁷ Such was Avignon in the early years of the popes, and as the population continued to increase, conditions improved but slightly if at all. Some of the richer cardinals moved to Villeneuve (like the Catalan envoys), and built palaces and housed their staffs in airier, pleasanter quarters than could be found

⁵⁴ Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, doc. 265, pp. 398–401, from a letter addressed to James II of Aragon-Catalonia, dated at Avignon on 11 October, 1323.

⁵⁵ Finke, *Acta*, I, doc. 264, pp. 396–97, to James II, dated after 8 October, 1323, and cf. Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* (1962), p. 232, and on Napoleone Orsini, see, *ibid.*, pp. 241–44.

⁵⁶ John XXII intended to check the extravagance of the cardinals' households by the ineffective decretal *De honestate cardinalium* of October, 1316, on which see Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon*, pp. 253–54, and especially Norman P. Zacour, "Papal Regulation of Cardinals' Households in the Fourteenth Century," *Speculum*, L (1975), 434–55. The decretal or constitution in question is perhaps better known, from its incipit, as *Dat vivendi normam*.

⁵⁷ Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, docs. 147–48, pp. 224–27, dated 17 October and 19 November, 1316. On Vidal de Villanova, see, *ibid.*, I, introd., pp. CLIX–CLX, and on the mission, cf. Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català* (1947), doc. 10, pp. 119–21.

in Avignon. The remains of some of their "livrées" may still be seen by the church of Notre Dame and along the Rue de la République in Villeneuve. It is small wonder, then, that the Black Death took such a toll of life among the curialists in 1348 when fourteen couriers were buried in June and July at the modest cost of two florins for each funeral.⁵⁸ But the crowding in certain parishes only became worse with the years. The plague of 1348 carried off some 93 known members of the Curia (about 14 per cent of the total number of curial officials and lesser functionaries), and the murderous plague of 1361 removed some 97 curialists (or about 18 per cent of the total). The mortality was higher in the rest of the city and in various religious communities in the Midi, and yet many names of curialists (4,253 are known for the period between 1309 and 1376) disappear from the records with no indication that it was the plague which removed them from the scene.⁵⁹

Although the riches of the Vatican Archives seem inexhaustible, we do not lack printed sources. Almost every aspect of life at the Curia is illustrated by Karl Heinrich Schäfer's remarkable volumes on *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer*, which give us easy access to the expenditures (*exitus*) of the Camera under certain of the Avignonese popes. Here we may find the costs of papal coronations, banquets, and funerals, weddings of papal nieces and nephews, gifts to princes, ambassadors, cardinals, and other dignitaries. The salaries of curial officials and chaplains, fees for physicians, expenses of nuncios and couriers, and wages of servitors may be followed from month to month. The costs of paper and parchment, of binding books and sealing documents, and fees for illuminators are all duly recorded. The papal accounts preserve some extraordinary data on the sums paid to Matteo Giovanetti of Viterbo for (still extant) frescoes in the papal palace, and year after year record expenditures for wages and building materials, fees for contractors, and pur-

chases of adjacent lands and houses under both Benedict XII and Clement VI to enlarge the palace. The costs of maintaining the papal kitchen, pantry, wine cellar, and stables, and the prices paid for oil, food, spices, confections, and medicine, cloth, clothing, and vestments are all listed with minute exactitude. We catch glimpses of Clement VI preparing his tomb in the Benedictine monastery at Chaise Dieu (Casa Dei) and of Innocent VI preparing his tomb in the Carthusian convent at Villeneuve-lès-Avignon.⁶⁰

The cameral scribes kept careful records of expenditures, and Johann Peter Kirsch has provided us with archival texts which make it possible to assess the costs of moving the papacy from Avignon to Rome under Urban V (from 30 April to 16 October, 1367) and again under Gregory XI (from 13 September, 1376, to 17 January, 1377). Unlike his predecessor, Gregory of course never left Rome, where he died on 27 March, 1378. The Curia moved slowly, and on both the journeys to Rome the *curiales* consumed the usual abundant quantities of wine, fish, pork, and cheese, and used reams of parchment. Both the Lateran palace and the Vatican had fallen into the saddest disrepair during the popes' absence of more than sixty years, and since Urban had decided to live at S. Peter's, the Vatican palace required new roofs, ceilings, doors, windows, and other details of restoration, for which 15,569 gold florins were paid out from 27 April, 1367, to 5 November, 1368.⁶¹ The Lateran basilica, S. Paolo fuori le Mura,⁶² and other churches had to be restored, the Vatican gardens and vineyards laid out anew, stables rebuilt, walls, roads, and aqueducts repaired, and expensive provision made for the cardinals and the Curia.

⁵⁸ Karl Heinrich Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI. (1335-1362)*, Paderborn, 1914, pp. 388-89, 392 (in the *Vatikanische Quellen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung, 1316-1378*, vol. III).

⁵⁹ Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon*, pp. 441-49, 556-59, and on the housing problems caused by Clement V's decision to settle, and John XXII's to remain, in Avignon, see, *ibid.*, pp. 532-56.

⁶⁰ Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI.* (1914), pp. 286, 357, 451-52, 802, 803. Although damaged, both tombs still exist. The amounts expended by Clement to rebuild the Chaise Dieu may be found in the Arch. Segr. Vaticano, *Introitus et Exitus*, Reg. 258. On life and work in Avignon, see Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon*, pp. 38-77, 225-40, 251-695, whose whole book is a social and administrative study of life in and around the Curia.

⁶¹ J. P. Kirsch, *Die Rückkehr der Päpste Urban V. und Gregor XI. von Avignon nach Rom: Auszüge aus den Kameralregistern des Vatikanischen Archivs*, Paderborn, 1898, pp. xxix ff., 96 ff. A good deal can be learned of the Vatican palace in the fourteenth century from these accounts, of which D. Redig de Campos has made little or no use in his work on *I Palazzi Vaticani*, Bologna, 1967.

⁶² Kirsch, *Die Rückkehr der Päpste*, pp. 104, 106.

Urban spent 4,000 florins to have silver reliquaries made to hold the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul.⁶³ There was a boom in the building trades. Carpenters were kept busy making furniture and redoing rooms in the papal palace and in the lodgings of the cardinals and curial officials. Founders were casting church bells. Quantities of wine were sent from Avignon:⁶⁴ it would take the Curia a long time to get used to the Italian wines. During his sixth regnal year (from 6 November, 1367, to 5 November, 1368), Urban spent 15,737 gold florins and 150 gold ducats on the *castrum apostolicum* at Montefiascone,⁶⁵ where he wanted to spend the summer, and the *exitus* accounts bear witness to the purposes for which the money was spent and to the extreme discomfort under which curial officials were laboring as the court resumed its long-deferred residence in Rome.

While plans were still being made in Avignon for the first return to S. Peter's (in 1365), and Urban was concerned about replanting the Vatican garden and vineyards,⁶⁶ he tried to recruit crusaders for an anti-Turkish expedition from among the freebooting members of the mercenary companies which were then destroying Italy.⁶⁷ One of the highlights of Urban's three years in Rome (or rather in Italy) was the declaration of Latin Catholic faith by the Byzantine Emperor John V Palaeologus, who was seeking aid against the Turks. The ceremony took place on the feast of S. Luke (18 October, 1369) at the hospital of S. Spirito "in Sassia," and three days later Urban received the emperor on the steps of S. Peter's, accepted his obeisance, and entered the church with him for the celebration of mass. John remained in Rome for five months, and then went on with his retinue to Venice; Urban returned to Avignon, to Petrarch's eloquent irritation. John had of course accepted the Latin faith for himself alone; no Greek clergy had accompanied him;

and although it was in no way a union of the Churches, it obviously seemed to the Curia a step in the right direction.⁶⁸ But the Greeks and Latins had long since taken separate roads and when, seventy years later, the union of the Churches was proclaimed at Florence, the Greek clergy and people chose not to accept it.

The boldness and frequency of Turkish raids from the Anatolian emirates evoked constant fear in Venice, Avignon, and Paris. On 21 June and 16 July, 1318, Niccolò Ziani (Zane), the Venetian duke of Crete, and his feudatories complained to the Doge Giovanni Soranzo that the Turks were continually harassing the Aegean islands and Venetian merchantmen despite the *pax et concordia* which the Republic had with the Turkish authorities. When Ziani remonstrated, he received fair words in answer, *sed dicti Turchi [sunt] homines sine fide*, and large-scale attacks upon the islands showed every sign of continuing.⁶⁹ The Venetians lived almost entirely on their overseas commerce,⁷⁰ as everyone on the lagoon realized, and were always alarmed when Moslem pirates or others interrupted the transport of goods on the sea lanes of the Mediterranean.

Distant as Crete was from Venice, it had been one of the Republic's most valuable eastern possessions for more than a century. The Venetians had acquired Boniface of Montferrat's rights to the island in August, 1204,⁷¹ as we have noted, and thereafter they had had to wrest it from the Greeks and protect it against the Genoese.⁷² The passing years had required

⁶³ Kirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁶⁴ Kirsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 ff.

⁶⁵ Kirsch, *op. cit.*, pp. xxx, 96 ff. On 20 July, 1365, Urban had ordered Cardinal Gil de Albornoz to prepare the fortified palace at Viterbo to receive the Curia (A. Theiner, ed., *Codex diplomaticus domini temporalis S. Sedis*, II [1862, repr. 1964], doc. CCCCXIII, p. 437), which probably explains why so little seems to have been spent in 1367-1368 on Viterbo, where Urban also lived during part of the summer.

⁶⁶ Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus*, II, doc. CCCCVIII, p. 430.

⁶⁷ Theiner, II, doc. CCCCIV, pp. 429-30, and on the free companies in Italy, see the long bull *Clamat ad nos* (*ibid.*, doc. CCCCX, pp. 430-37, dated 13 April, 1366).

⁶⁸ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum avinionensium*, I, 364, 372, 388, 391-92, 401, and vol. IV, 135-36; K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), 46-47, with refs. to the works of L. Allacci, O. Raynaldus, G. Golubovich, B. Altaner, A. A. Vasiliev, and esp. O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (1355-1375)*, Warsaw, 1930, repr. London, 1972, pp. 188-200. On John V Palaeologus in Rome and Venice, see below, Chapter 13.

⁶⁹ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 61-62, pp. 107-9. Ziani believed that the Catalans in the Athenian duchy were allies of the Turks (*ibid.*, I, no. 63, p. 110).

⁷⁰ Cf. *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 105, p. 208, doc. from the year 1327: "... negotiationum comercia, de quibus dumtaxat civitas nostra vivit, que in mari constituta caret totaliter vineis atque campis. . . ."

⁷¹ G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, I (Vienna, 1856, repr. 1964), doc. CXXIII, pp. 512-15.

⁷² On the establishment of the Venetian military colony in Crete, see Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II, docs.

an unceasing vigilance and a large investment in men and money to hold on to the island. Although for the most part the Greek inhabitants of Crete, both nobles and peasants, remained in possession of their property, and retained their civil law, they were restive and rebellious. The duke of Candia generally held office for two years, and was assisted by two special councillors and two councils. The *consilium maius* was made up of all the Venetian nobles resident in Crete. Venice gave lands and fiefs in Crete to various of her citizens, who rendered military service to the duke of Candia for such holdings. She also granted and confirmed possession of fiefs to Greek nobles on the island, who performed certain naval, military, and administrative duties until the Venetian withdrawal after four centuries of often turbulent rule.⁷³

The Venetians found it difficult to achieve a peaceful tenure of Crete. They came into the island as a Latin-Catholic military caste, whose loyalty to the home government was to be maintained by a rigid separation from the Orthodox Greek natives, who bitterly resented their political and social inferiority as well as the economic servitude to which exclusion from local government and (in the earlier period) from military service imposed upon most of them. No Cretan of Greek origin, for example, could marry a Latin until the end of the thirteenth century, and such intermarriage always remained rare. The sons of S. Mark led

an almost garrison existence on Crete, for Greek uprisings were frequent, but many Venetian families were enriched by the commerce which flowed in and out of the harbors of the island.

Crete was rich in natural products, and exported minerals, wax, silk, cheese, sugar, honey, and wines tempting even to Moslem palates. Wheat, however, was the chief export, and farming was always more important than fishing, as well as safer. The island's situation on the main routes of the eastern Mediterranean made it one of the chief commercial centers of the Levant. Venetian ships bound for eastern ports regularly stopped at their well-fortified stations of Modon and Coron (in the southwestern Morea), the "chief eyes of the Commune" (*oculi capitales Comunis*), as they were sometimes called, before proceeding on to Candia, where great Venetian walls and the fortress still bearing the leonine escutcheon of S. Mark stand in the harbor of modern Heraklion.⁷⁴ From Candia they would sail direct to Alexandria, carrying on the lucrative trade which the papacy always deplored and often forbade.

The pragmatic Venetians much preferred peace to the crusade, for crusading fleets might be as destructive of business as the Moslem pirates from the Anatolian emirates. On 17 December, 1331, the Venetian government received from King Philip VI of France a letter (dated 18 November) in which he asked that certain good and experienced citizens of the Republic be sent to him by Christmas to tell him how many and what kinds of ships and supplies would be needed for the crusade which he planned, what the costs would be, and what Venice was herself prepared to do and to supply for the hazardous enterprise. He also wanted the Venetian envoys to be granted the authority requisite to commit the Republic to a definite course of action.⁷⁵

CCXXXIX-CCXXX, pp. 129-42, dated September and October, 1211; cf., *ibid.*, II, docs. CCXXXII-XXXIII and ff., pp. 143-50, 159-68, 210-13, 234-49, 250-53, 312, etc.; Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne* (1959), pp. 87-88, 95-100, 107-8, 113-14, and esp. pp. 122-39; and, in general, Silvano Borsari, *Il Dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1963. The Greeks of Nicaea and, after 1261, of Constantinople never abated their ambition to repossess the strategically located island (cf. Tafel and Thomas, III [1857, repr. 1964], doc. CCCL, p. 57).

⁷³ Ernst Gerland, "Histoire de la noblesse crétoise au moyen-âge," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, XI (1905-6, repr. 1964), 50-56, 67-79, has printed examples of Venetian grants and confirmations of fiefs from the mid-thirteenth century as well as notices of naval and military impositions of the later sixteenth century, all relating to the archontic family of Varouchas. He also gives the decision of 20/30 August, 1669, whereby among other requests the Cretan assembly of feudatories asked that the Republic allow Greek as well as Venetian families to settle in other islands and territories belonging to S. Mark (as the Turks were taking possession of Crete), to which petition the captain-general Francesco Morosini gave an affirmative answer on 2 September, 1669, confirmed by the Venetian Senate on 30 October (*ibid.*, pp. 85-93).

⁷⁴ Cf. Setton, "The Latins in Greece and the Aegean," *Cambridge Medieval History*, IV-1 (1966), 427-28; Silvano Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo*, Naples, 1966; and Mario Abrate, "Creta-Colonia veneziana nei secoli XIII-XV," *Economia e storia: Rivista italiana di storia economica e sociale*, IV-3 (1957), 251-77.

⁷⁵ *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 109, pp. 219-20. On the various abortive attempts of France, Naples, and the Avignonese papacy to organize a crusade (usually against Byzantium) from 1313 to about 1330, see Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, pp. 673-90; Gottfried Dürrhofer, *Die Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johann XXII. (1316-1334)*, Strassburg, 1913, pp. 11-61, in detail; and A. E. Laiou,

The Venetians did not reply until 11 May of the following year. Their envoys were to inform Philip that the support of the papacy and the establishment of peace in Europe would be essential to the success of his project. As for military forces, 20,000 horse (*milites*) and 50,000 foot (*pedites*) should suffice for the recovery of the Holy Land. The Venetians said they were willing to supply at the king's expense at least one hundred galleys, horse transports, and other vessels to carry eastward 5,000 horses, 5,000 mounted men, 10,000 squires, and 20,000 foot "with their arms, harness, and food and fodder sufficient for the said persons and horses for one year, carrying the foodstuffs in two trips [*in duabus vicibus seu muduis*]." Supplies might be secured in Naples, Sicily, Greece, the Black Sea, and in the island of Crete. When the *passagium generale* was in fact organized, and Philip VI was setting out himself, the Venetians would furnish at their own expense 4,000 *homines de mari* and galleys enough to take them eastward, and would maintain this naval ensemble through the six most navigable months of the year, even leaving some of their galleys in service through the winter.⁷⁶

Philip VI had talked of a crusade for some four years before he finally took the cross at Paris on 1 October, 1333, after Pierre Roger, archbishop of Rouen (and later Pope Clement VI), had preached a crusading sermon before an assembly of French prelates and barons, at which Philip III of Navarre and the dukes of Brabant, Burgundy, and Bourbon also committed themselves to participating in a "saint voyage d'outremer." But one thing or another always required Philip VI to postpone his departure for the East (especially, of course, his uncertainty as to Edward III's next move against France), and finally on 13 March, 1336, Benedict XII would request him to put off the

crusade until tranquillity had been restored among the European states.⁷⁷

The Angevins were always interested in the East. Philip [I] of Taranto had borne from 1313 the proud title of Latin emperor,⁷⁸ but his claim to the throne of Constantinople was taken seriously only in Naples. The Venetians had encouraged Philip VI in his crusading plans, and of course they looked also to the Angevin court at Naples. Various Venetian documents from the years 1331–1333 relate to projects for a crusade, and on 6 April, 1332, the Senate instructed their consul of Apulia to urge Robert the Wise to join the anti-Turkish league which was then being organized. The consul had already found Robert well disposed to the idea.⁷⁹

The fear of the Turk became so great that the Venetians finally decided upon more purposive action. On 22 June, 1332, the Senate forbade, under heavy penalties, Venetian merchants to trade with the Turks, since such commerce was adding to the infidels' strength, and on 7 July the Senate charged the new bailie on his way to Constantinople to seek the participation of the Emperor Andronicus III in an anti-Turkish league. The bailie was to keep his colleagues in Crete and Negroponte informed as to the

⁷⁷ Viard, "Les Projets de croisade . . .," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XCVII (1936), 305–16; Dürrholder, *Kreuzzugspolitik*, pp. 67–70. Philip VI took the cross more than once.

⁷⁸ Philip of Taranto had vainly sought Venetian support in June, 1320, for his unrealistic ambition to recover Constantinople (Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I [1880, repr. 1965], no. 82, pp. 170–71). In 1313 Clement V had again urged the crusade upon the European sovereigns, in the hope that Christendom might draw some advantage from the armed dissension which then obtained among the Moslems, but western nobles and knights obviously found the tournament more attractive than the battlefield (cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1313, nos. 1–7, vol. XXIV [Bar-le-Duc, 1872], pp. 1–2).

⁷⁹ Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 15, fol. 8^r: "Capta quod respondeatur consuli Appulie quod intelleximus verba domini regis in facto Turchorum et bonam voluntatem suam secundum placitum Dei et bonum fidei, de quo animus noster fuit multum gavisus, qui desideravimus semper et desideramus persecutionem et desolationem Turchorum ipsorum, . . . videntes iam diu qualiter ipsi Turchi persequabantur hostiliter partes Romanie . . .," and the consul was to urge Robert of Naples to join with the Venetians, the Hospitallers, and others in Romania and elsewhere against the Turks. Cf. the summary in Freddy Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I (Paris, 1958), no. 13, p. 25, and cf. Jules Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient (1342–1352)*, Paris, 1904, pp. 21 ff., and Jorga [Iorga] *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), pp. 37–38.

Constantinople and the Latins, pp. 249 ff., 311–12, 315–20. During the years 1324–1327 Andronicus II, who had abandoned his anti-Latin religious policy, carried on (like his father before him) negotiations for reunion with the Roman Church, in which Miss Laiou believes he was sincere (*ibid.*, pp. 320–29). In 1328 Andronicus II was deposed by his grandson Andronicus III, who ruled until 1341 (Ursula V. Bosch, *Kaiser Andronikos III. Palaiologos*, Amsterdam, 1965).

⁷⁶ *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 110, pp. 220–22; Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, I, 87–88; Dürrholder, *Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johann XXII.*, pp. 63–64; Jules Viard, "Les Projets de croisade de Philippe VI de Valois," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XCVII (1936), 307–8.

extent of his success at the imperial court while they advised him of the progress of their own negotiations with the island dynasts and the Hospitallers.⁶⁰ The diplomatic wheels

⁶⁰ Misti, Reg. 15, fols. 19^v, 21^r, summarized in Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, nos. 17, 20, pp. 26–27, and the text of the latter document (of 7 July, 1332) is printed in Sp. M. Theotokes, *Θεοπίσματα τῆς Βενετικῆς Γερουσίας (1281–1385)*, Athens, 1936, doc. 5, pp. 108–9 (in the *Μνημεῖα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας*, II-1).

⁶¹ *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 113, 116, pp. 224, 228, and cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 22, p. 27. On 20 July the Senate also instructed the captain of the galleys of Romania to load at Modon and take to Negroponte all the ship's biscuit he could for the needs of the fleet to be assembled against the Turks (*ibid.*, I, no. 23, p. 27). The Venetians had had an anti-Turkish league in mind for several years. In October, 1324, the Senate had apparently instructed the duke and councillors of Crete to "sit on" plans for a *concordia* with the Turks (from the rubrics of the lost registers of the Misti, in Roberto Cessi and Paolo Sambin, eds., *Le Deliberazioni del Consiglio dei Rogati (Senato)*, serie "Mistorum," I [libri I–XIV], Venice, 1960, Reg. 8, no. 107, p. 291: "quod super-sedeant de perficiendo concordiam cum Turchis"). In March, 1325, *savi* or *sapientes* were elected *super tractanda societate contra Turchos*, obviously the sea-going Turks of the coastal emirates (*ibid.*, no. 175, p. 296), and by July, 1327, a note of urgency seems to have entered senatorial letters (sent in the doge's name) to the duke and councillors of Crete and to the bailies and councillors of both Negroponte and Constantinople, requesting news of such progress as had been made in the attempt to arrange an anti-Turkish alliance (*societas*) with the Byzantine emperor, the master of the Hospital, the Genoese magnate Martino Zaccaria of Chios [on whom see Ludovico Gatto, "Per la Storia di Martino Zaccaria, signore di Chio," *Bullettino dell' "Archivio paleografico italiano"*, II–III (1956–57), 325–45, with five documents], and "all others" who might be involved (Cessi and Sambin, *op. cit.*, Reg. 10, no. 194, p. 341, and cf. no. 202). The Senate also provided, in December, 1327, that ten galleys should "again" be armed to patrol the Adriatic and the coasts of Romania, and that the colonies [in the Levant] should also maintain galleys in readiness (*ibid.*, Reg. 10, no. 270, p. 348).

Venice persisted in her efforts to do something *de facto* *Turchorum* (Cessi and Sambin, *op. cit.*, Reg. 11, nos. 247, 274, pp. 380, 382, dated March, 1329). In January, 1331, the Senate wrote John XXII of the need for action against the Turks, and instructed the duke of Crete to alert the Cretans to arm themselves against the Turks and to co-operate with the Negropontini (Reg. 13, nos. 263–64, p. 434, and note no. 302): Crete seems to have suffered Turkish attacks (Reg. 14, no. 36, p. 444). In January, 1332, the Senate voted to send ambassadors to Avignon and the French court, presumably to urge the crusade upon both John XXII and Philip VI (*ibid.*, nos. 326–29, p. 467).

As is well known, the Venetian publicist Marino Sanudo was active throughout this period, and in two notable letters he sent Philip VI of France (1) his own plans for the crusade, and (2) a survey of conditions in the East. The first letter is dated 27 April, 1332 ("mense Aprilis die IIII exeunte"), and the second on 13 October, 1334 (Friedrich Kunsmann, "Studien über Marino Sanudo den Älteren," *Abhandlungen der historischen Classe der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, VII [1855], app., *epp.* v–vi, pp. 791–808, and cf. *epp.* vii–x). See Angeliki E. Laiou, "Ma-

were now turning more rapidly, and on 18 July the Doge Francesco Dandolo commissioned Pietro Zeno, captain and bailie of Negroponte, and Pietro da Canale, "captain of the galleys of the Gulf," to arrange an alliance against the Turks with whomever they could, and especially with the Byzantine emperor and with Hélon de Villeneuve, the master of the Hospitallers.⁶¹ Canale found Andronicus most receptive to the idea of forming a union "for the pursuit of the Turks and the defense of the orthodox faith" (*ad persecutionem Turchorum et defensionem fidei orthodoxe*), and on 26 August (1332) the emperor made the Venetian captain his own agent to make an alliance with the master "and with all others" for joint action against the Turks.⁶²

From the Venetian standpoint the time for action had certainly come. Pope John XXII, who had been doing his best to launch an expedition against the Turks, wrote the Doge Francesco Dandolo on 23 July, 1332, that the injuries which the Venetians had suffered at Turkish hands could well be a visitation of divine justice upon them because of the negligent complacency with which the Republic had allowed schismatics and heretics such unseemly freedom in her overseas possessions.⁶³ But the Venetians had ceased to require papal exhortations. On 6 September (1332) Pietro da Canale, as representative of both Venice and Byzantium, had met with the master Hélon de Villeneuve in the latter's chamber at Rhodes in the presence of witnesses to form a *unio*, *confederatio*, *liga et societas* "for the exaltation and praise of the divine name and the confusion of the Agarenes." The union was to last for five years, and it was to maintain a fleet of twenty well-armed and fully equipped galleys, of which Byzantium was to contribute ten, Venice six, and the Hospitallers four. The fleet was to assemble in the harbor of Negroponte by 15 April, 1333, when all the galleys should be ready for action against the Turks. Canale

rino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks: The Background to the Anti-Turkish League of 1332–1334," *Speculum*, XLV (1970), 374–92, and cf. her *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 313–15. A reprint of Sanudo's *Secreta fidelium crucis* (from Jacques Bongars' *Gesta Dei per Francos*, II, Hanau, 1611), with a foreword by Joshua Prawer, was published in 1972 by the University of Toronto Press.

⁶² *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 116, p. 227. The imperial document was a chrysobull signed *manu nostra rubea subscriptione*, but Andronicus did not have a gold seal at hand!

⁶³ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1332, no. 23, vol. XXIV (1872), p. 499.

and Hélión de Villeneuve exchanged solemn oaths that the union would be resolutely (*inconcusse*) preserved for the stated five years.⁸⁴

By 1333 the Angevins, the Venetians, and the Avignonese papacy were confronted with an unforeseen enemy. A new star appeared to have arisen in the Turkish firmament, the young Umur Pasha, soon to succeed his father Mehmed as emir of "Aydin" (the ancient Lydia) in western Asia Minor. In 1328–1329 Umur Pasha had taken the harbor fortress of Smyrna from the famous Martino Zaccaria, and thus opened up the Aegean to even more extensive Turkish raids. Umur Pasha next made an attempt, apparently in August, 1332, upon Byzantine Gallipoli, and in 1332 (or 1333) also led a plundering expedition against the margraviate of Boudonitza, the northern coast of Negroponte, and the eastern shores of the Morea, and landed briefly on the then Byzantine-held island of Salamis. Since, however, Umur Pasha's father Mehmed was supposed to have a treaty with the Byzantine government, Umur directed his hostility chiefly against the Latin states in Greece and the islands.⁸⁵

The date of the appointed rendezvous had meanwhile slipped past with no effective action. The pope and King Robert of Naples were still enthusiastic about the league, and eager to get it moving. In a letter to the doge (on 28

August, 1333), the pope dilated on the continued lamentable state of eastern affairs and on the harsh oppression of the Turks.⁸⁶ The Cretans were in revolt against Venetian authority, however, throughout the late summer and fall of 1333, and although the Senate stressed its desire to meet all the Republic's obligations to the newly formed league, it proved difficult to do so until the insurgents had been suppressed.⁸⁷

Robert, despite Andronicus's accession to the league and the resulting conflict with the Angevin-Valois claim to Constantinople, had become so favorable to the idea of the crusade that he proposed to Pope John XXII in 1333 that the tithes being collected in Italy should be spent on a war "*adversus Turcarum irruptiones*." John replied (on 19 November) that nothing could be decided upon without consulting Philip VI, who had in fact been granted a six years' tithe for a crusade overseas: John had no intention, he told Robert, of placing the whole burden of a crusade upon the papacy. When the king of France was ready to go, and the other princes were prepared to join him, Christendom would not find lacking either the resources of the Church or the counsels of the Sacred College.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 116, pp. 225–26, 228–29. On the following day (7 September, 1332) Canale and Hélión de Villeneuve agreed that during conflict the commander (*capitaneus*) of the twenty galleys should be a Venetian (*ibid.*, I, no. 117, p. 229).

⁸⁵ Cf. Paul Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident: Recherches sur "La Geste d'Umur Pacha"*, Paris, 1957, esp. pp. 63–88 (Bibliothèque byzantine, Études, 2). Besides the contemporary Greek and Latin sources Lemerle has employed with unusual effect the *destân* or *geste* of Umur Pasha, who was born late in the year 1309, became emir of Aydin in January, 1334, and died in May, 1348. The *geste* in question is that presented in the eighteenth book of the fifteenth-century Turkish chronicler Enveri's poem called the *Düstürnâme* (or *Book of Instructions*, ed. and trans. Irène Mélikoff-Sayar, *Le Destân d'Umûr Pacha [Düstürnâme-i Enveri]*, Paris, 1954, Bibliothèque byzantine, Documents, 2). This *geste* seems itself to be a close adaptation of the account of Umur Pasha's career as given in a lost work of one Hajji Selman.

When Umur Pasha's troops appeared under the walls of Boudonitza, the margraviate was ruled by Guglielma Pallavicini, on whom note Wm. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, pp. 251–53, and "A Lady of Thermopylae," in the *Homenatge a Antoni Rubió i Lluch [Estudis Universitaris Catalans, XXI]*, Barcelona, 1936, pp. 399–403.

⁸⁶ Raynaldus, ad ann. 1333, nos. 13 ff., vol. XXIV, pp. 511 ff., and cf. Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 115, pp. 224–25, who has misdated the letter of 28 August to the year 1332, and misled Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 91, into the same error. Raynaldus, *loc. cit.*, dates it correctly 1333, "datum V Kal. Septembris, anno XVII:" the seventeenth year of John XXII extended from 5 September, 1332, to 4 September, 1333. On 21 August, 1333, the pope wrote Count Charles of Alençon that among other depredations the Turks had attacked the Catalan duchy of Athens, "quod Turci contra Christianos tam per mare quam per terram adeo invaluerunt quod burgos Athenienses combusserunt . . ." (*ibid.*, ad ann. 1333, no. 14, vol. XXIV, p. 512).

⁸⁷ Cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, nos. 34–39, 41–42, 48, pp. 29–33. ⁸⁸ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1333, no. 15, vol. XXIV, p. 513. But the pope had for some time been trying to assist the league against the Turks, and on 10 October (1333) he had written a rhetorical letter on the Turkish danger to Bertrand de Déaux, archbishop of Embrun, whom he sent to confer with King Robert and the Venetian Doge Francesco Dandolo *ad refrenandos Turcorum ipsorum malignos impetus, repellendos insultus, compescendam nequitiam et conterendam superbiam* (*ibid.*, no. 16, pp. 513–14).

The very interesting reply of the Venetian government to John XXII's letter of 10 October, 1333, may be found in Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 124, pp. 241–42, doc. undated. The doge and his councillors state: "Although the power of the perfidious Turks is great, nevertheless there are several Turkish states [*dominia*] in those regions, of which each one is distinct from the others, and one could not quickly render aid to another; therefore [the doge and

At the time of Umur Pasha's attack upon Negroponte, the Venetian bailie was the stalwart Pietro Zeno, who was soon put in charge of the galleys recruited for the anti-Turkish league. In a large naval engagement fought in the coastal inlet near Adramyttium (Edremit) Zeno defeated Yakhshi, the emir of Karasi, on Wednesday, 14 September, 1334, which reduced Turkish raids in the Aegean for a while, but did not diminish either Umur Pasha's boldness or his strength.⁹⁰ When Pope John XXII died (on 4 December, 1334), furthermore, and England and France moved closer to the conflict which became the Hundred Years' War, the league ceased to function. Early in the new year Umur Pasha resumed his attacks upon Christian territory, this time the Morea.⁹⁰

By the beginning of the fifth decade of the fourteenth century, just before Pierre Roger

his government] believe that fifty horse transports [*usserii*], in each of which there should be at least 120 rowers and 20 men-at-arms [*equites*] with the horses and arms they need, and forty armed galleys, in each of which there should be 200 men,—these would suffice to check the Turkish savagery, and with these men-at-arms, transports, and galleys they hope that all the infidels' ships might be burned. . . . [The Turks might also be attacked in their own lands,] and if these things were done, the Christians in Romania would be secure, and the power of the Moslems [*Agareni*] themselves would be almost entirely broken. . . ." Unfortunately amid the countless references in Venetian, papal, and other documents to *infideles*, *maledicti Turchi*, *perfidii ipsi*, etc., we seldom find their *dominia distincta* clearly identified until a reference to the Turks simply means the Osmanlis. The Venetians also pointed out that "breaking the power of the Agarenes" (in western Asia Minor) was the indispensable first step toward the recovery of the Holy Land, which was then held by the Mamluk soldan of Egypt.

⁹⁰ See Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 96–98, who gives references to the sources, namely Giovanni Villani, the annals of Monaldeschi and S. Antoninus, the chronicles of Delfino and Andrea Dandolo, and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1334, nos. 7–11, vol. XXV (Bar-le-Duc, 1872), pp. 3–5. Pietro Zeno had been bailie and captain of Negroponte from 1331 to 1333 (Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes*, p. 372); it was he who had checked Umur Pasha's attack upon Negroponte (Lemerle, *op. cit.*, pp. 81–83). On Venetian plans and preparations for the anti-Turkish offensive, note the summaries of documents in Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II (1878), bk. III, nos. 252, 264–65, 311–12, 341, and esp. nos. 321, 342, and cf. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, I, nos. 15, 17, 20, 22–23, 25, 36–39, pp. 25 ff. Marino Sanudo describes the victory of the Christian league in a letter to Hugh IV, king of Cyprus, for which see Chas. de la Roncière and Léon Dorez, "Lettres inédites . . . de Marino Sanudo l'Ancien (1334–1337)," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LVI (1895), 25–26, with the text on pp. 35–36, and cf. Dürrhofer, *Kreuzzugspolitik*, p. 74, and Laiou, "Marino Sanudo Torsello," *Speculum*, XLV, 387.

⁹⁰ Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 102–6.

was elected pope as Clement VI (on 7 May, 1342), the Turkish menace in the eastern Mediterranean had reached alarming proportions. The Latins had not achieved a noteworthy success against the Moslems since the fall of Acre, and there is no dearth of texts to illustrate Christian apprehensions. The Venetians had seen the Aegean islands and the Greek mainland ravaged until there seemed little left to plunder, and now the Turks of the Anatolian emirates were sending large armadas as far afield as Crete, which was one of the prized possessions of the Republic. A decree of the Grand Council (*Maggior Consiglio*), dated 14 January, 1341, depicts the situation clearly:

If ever there was a time and a need to provide for the protection of the island [of Crete], such a time is at hand . . . because of the Turks, whose power on the sea has grown to the extent that they have destroyed all the islands and districts of Greece, and not being able to seize Christian property elsewhere, they threaten to come with the greatest armada[s] to the island of Crete, and have already begun [to do so], and unless provision be made for its defense against the Turks, grave peril could beset the island. . . .

The Grand Council therefore decided that, whereas foreign merchants might trade freely at Crete in all merchandise except cloth (*draparia*), they were to pay a one per cent duty on all imports and another one per cent on all exports, the funds thus collected being reserved for the defense of the island.⁹¹

Turkish raids, however, were not carried out against all Christian territories at this time. Umur Pasha of Aydin, one of the most enterprising of the emirs and the good friend of John [VI] Cantacuzenus since their meeting at Clazomenae late in the year 1335, had long refrained from attacking Byzantine territories. Umur had in fact served the imperial government as a sort of condottiere on more than one occasion (against the Genoese at New Phocaea and Lesbos and even against the Albanians). The most powerful of the emirs of Asia Minor (*Λυδίας γὰρ καὶ Ἰωνίας οὗτος ὢν ἡγεμὼν*),

⁹¹ Sp. M. Theotokes, *Ἀποφάσεις Μείζονος Συμβουλίου Βενετίας (1255–1669)*, Athens, 1933, from the *Liber Spiritus*, doc. 14, pp. 118–19 (in the *Μνημεῖα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας*, I–2). The serious disaffection of both Venetian colonists and Greek proprietors was shown by the uprising in 1333, already mentioned, and by another in 1342; see Marino Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, RISS, XXII (Milan, 1733), 607, and A. Navagero, *Storia veneziana*, RISS, XXIII (Milan, 1733), 1025, 1031.

Umur directed much of his attention toward the Latin states, and ranged the wide waters of the Aegean, exacting tribute, pillaging, and carrying off rich booty to be divided among his followers.⁹² His raids extended even into Bulgaria and Serbia. After the death of the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus III (in June, 1341), Umur assisted the ambitious Cantacuzenus against the Zealots and the nationalist party in Thessalonica and against the Palaeologian court in Constantinople.⁹³ The close ties between Umur and Cantacuzenus lasted until Umur's death (in May, 1348), and he helped make possible Cantacuzenus's ascent to the Byzantine throne. Umur lived largely by tribute and piracy, and like the emirs of a half-dozen other petty Moslem states in western Asia Minor he harassed the Latin states in Greece and the Aegean whenever the opportunity presented itself.

Piracy was less popular in Venice than anywhere else in Europe. More than one Avignonese nuncio had consulted the Signoria on the *viae et modi* of putting an end to Turkish enterprise in the eastern Mediterranean. Toward the end of 1333 the Senate had informed John XXII's nuncio Bertrand de Déaux (*de Deucio*), archbishop of Embrun, of the naval strength necessary to teach the Turks civility at sea,⁹⁴ and on 10 June, 1342, they gave

Clement VI the same answer when he addressed the same question to them. But now they increased their estimates of cost, because the strength of the emirs had increased. Sixty horse transports with at least 120 rowers and 20 horsemen in each, with horses and all necessary arms and equipment, making 1,200 horsemen all told, and 30 armed galleys with 200 men in each, making a total of 6,000 men besides the 7,200 rowers in the horse transports, should be sufficient to check the savagery of the Turks.⁹⁵

On 2 November, Clement wrote the doge again, recalling the losses which the Turks had caused Christians and the Venetians themselves. Henry d' Asti, Latin patriarch of Constantinople, was the bearer of the papal letter. He had helped to arrange a league on the pope's behalf with Hugh IV of Cyprus and the master and priors of the Hospital for an expedition against the Turks. Clement asked Venice to join the league, and announced that he was naming Guillaume Court, the "white cardinal," a nephew of the late Benedict XII, as apostolic legate to Venice and Naples.⁹⁶

345-46, 353-54, 363-64.

⁹² Cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, XII, 7, 2 (Bonn, II, 597), and Ducas, *Hist. byzant.*, chap. 7 (Bonn, p. 27, and ed. Vasile Grecu, *Ducas: Istoria turco-bizantină [1341-1462]*, Bucharest, 1958, p. 51).

⁹³ Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 107-15, 129-79, based chiefly upon Cantacuzenus, Gregoras, and Enveri's *Düstürnâme* (composed in 1465); note also E. Werner, "Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa and Orhan," *Byzantinoslavica*, XXVI (1965), 255-76, and G. Vismara, "Le Relazioni dell'impero con gli emirati selgiuchidi nel corso del secolo decimoquarto," *Byzantinische Forschungen*, III (1968), 210-21. On social conditions in the Byzantine world of the mid-fourteenth century, as revealed by contemporary sources, see Ihor Ševčenko, "Nicolas Cabasilas' 'Anti-Zealot' Discourse: A Reinterpretation," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XI (1957), 81-171, with refs., and "Alexios Makrembolites and His 'Dialogue between the Rich and the Poor,'" *Recueil des travaux de l'Institut d'Études byzantines [de l'Académie serbe des Sciences]*, LXV, VI (Belgrade, 1960), 187-228; on the political background, Constantine P. Kyrris, "John Cantacuzenus and the Genoese, 1321-1348," *Miscellanea storica ligure*, III (Milan, 1963), 9-48; on the social history of the period, Günter Weiss, *Joannes Kantakuzenos—Aristokrat, Staatsmann, Kaiser und Mönch—in der Gesellschaftsentwicklung von Byzanz im 14. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden, 1969; and on the political and social institutions, Léon-Pierre Raybaud, *Le Gouvernement et l'administration centrale de l'empire byzantin sous les premiers Paléologues (1258-1354)*, Paris, 1968. On Umur Pasha's relations with Cantacuzenus, note Peter Schreiner, "La Chronique brève de 1352 . . .," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXXI (1965), no. 41 and pp. 337,

⁹⁴ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 124, pp. 241-42; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. III, no. 342, pp. 57-58; Sp. M. Theotokes, *Θεοπίσματα της Βενετικής Γερονσίας (1281-1385)*, Athens, 1936, doc. 27, pp. 139-41 (in the *Μνημεία της Ελληνικής Ιστορίας*, II-1). Bertrand de Déaux was created cardinal priest of S. Marco by Benedict XII on 18 December, 1338 (Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I [1913, repr. 1960], 17, 44; on his career, see Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* [1949], pp. 190, 201, 245-46, 283 ff., and Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* [1962], p. 271). John XXII had been much dedicated to the idea of the crusade, and (as noted below) had sent four galleys into the Aegean against the Turks, but the Italian wars had necessarily absorbed most of his money and attention.

⁹⁵ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 20, fol. 59r: The pope was to be informed: "quod usserii LX in quorum quolibet essent ad minus homines a remo CXX et equites XX cum equis et armis necessariis ipsis, qui omnes equites caperent summam equitum MCC, et pauciores esse nollent ad conterendum potentiam eorumdem [Turchorum], et galee XXX armate in quarum qualibet essent homines CC sufficienter ad refrenandum sevitiam eorumdem. . . ." This document has been published by Sp. M. Theotokes, *Θεοπίσματα της Βενετικής Γερονσίας (1281-1385)*, Athens, 1936, doc. 9, p. 217. In one way or another the documents selected for publication by Theotokes relate to Crete. Lambertino Balduino, bishop of Limassol (1337-1344) and envoy of Hugh IV of Cyprus, had appeared in Venice the year before, on his way to the Curia Romana to seek the means of repulsing the attacks of the Turks, "che minacciavano rovina a tutto il Levante cristiano" (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. III, no. 563, p. 99). Lambertino had already appealed to the master of Rhodes, who said he would also write to the Curia.

⁹⁶ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 18, p. 117, and cf. nos. 22, 24. Guillaume Court (*de Curte*) was created a

His Holiness seemed to be as serious about the crusade as John XXII had claimed to be, perhaps more so, and on 7 January, 1343, the Venetian Senate voted that five *sapientes* should be chosen "who may diligently consider the letters of the pope and the lord legate with regard to the Turks as well as the embassy of the said lord legate's nuncios concerning the same matter, and who may be able to confer and discuss the matter directly with the nuncios, and [then] give us their counsel in writing."⁹⁷ Four days later, on the eleventh, the Senate accepted the recommendations of the five *sapientes*: The papal embassy should be reminded of how often the Venetian government had called the attention of Clement's predecessors to the ever-increasing peril into which the Turks had plunged the Christian states (and merchants) in the Levant. The Senate had already suggested that forty well-armed galleys with 200 men in each and fifty horse transports with 120 rowers and 20 horsemen in each, which would mean a thousand horsemen (*equites*), would be able to curb the *prava potentia* of the Turks, "but whereas we do not believe that so large an armada of galleys could now be assembled so easily, and that provision could not even be made for the horsemen, some armada must be put together, which in our opinion should not be composed of fewer than twenty-five galleys. . . ." Whenever the pope could get ready such an armada, Venice was prepared to contribute a fourth part of it. If the armada consisted of twenty-five galleys, Venice would provide six of them, fully armed; of thirty-two galleys, she would give eight; and of forty, ten, *et sic per ratam numerorum*. The Senate suggested that the armada be held together for three years, or at least for one full year, "for the confusion of the infidels in winter and summer."⁹⁸

Crusades were expensive, and Clement VI was extravagant. His predecessor Benedict XII is alleged to have left 1,117,000 florins at his death, and Clement is said to have had an average annual income of 188,500 florins.⁹⁹

cardinal in the same *promotio* as Bertrand de Déaux (Eubel, II, 17, 41).

⁹⁷ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 21, fol. 8^r.

⁹⁸ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 136, pp. 263–65, dated 11 January, 1343, from the Misti, Reg. 21, fol. 8^r (Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 149, p. 51).

⁹⁹ K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII. nebst den Jahresbilanzen von 1316–1375*, Paderborn, 1911, introd., pp. 16, 17, and cf. Mollat, *Les*

At the beginning of his reign Clement could afford a crusade. As time passed, however, the expenditures for the Italian wars, the completion of the papal palace at Avignon, the purchase of the city from Joanna I of Naples, the gifts and loans to the French crown, and the luxury of his court reduced the Apostolic Camera to a pass from which his Avignonese successors could never rescue it. The pope and the Venetians had money in 1343, but the Florentine banking houses were hovering on the brink of ruin. The Acciajuoli, for example, owed Pedro Gomez de Barroso, cardinal bishop of Sabina, "great sums of money for legitimate reasons;" they could not repay him, but on 20 June Clement wrote Gautier de Brienne, titular duke of Athens and still lord of Florence, to compel the Acciajuoli to meet their obligations.¹⁰⁰

Papes d'Avignon, p. 518. The industry and learning displayed in Schäfer's studies of fourteenth-century papal finance are extraordinary, but unfortunately his compressed summaries of the *exitus* accounts (to save space) leave something to be desired.

There is a brief sketch of the two crusades, which took place during the reign of Clement VI, in Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886, I, 103–10. It is insufficient and inaccurate. The account in Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), pp. 39–62, although fuller and better, is still unsatisfactory. Jules Gay's thesis *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (1904) was very good in its time, although important sources are now available to which Gay had no access. A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (1938), pp. 290–318, is readable but rather inadequate, and contains errors that might easily have been avoided.

¹⁰⁰ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 32^r, published by Giovanni Guerrieri, "Nuovi Documenti intorno a Gualtieri VI di Brienne, duca d'Atene," *Arch. stor. italiano*, 5th ser., XXI (1898), 303–4, and listed (without text) in Eugène Déprez, ed., *Clément VI (1342–1352): Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, vol. I, fasc. 1 (1901), no. 234, col. 78 (cited hereafter as Déprez, I, fasc. 1).

After less than a year as lord of Florence, Gautier de Brienne fell from power on the feast of S. Anna (26 July, 1343), and after being under siege for a while in the Palazzo Vecchio, he was expelled from Florence. Believing him still held in confinement, on 7 August Clement wrote indignantly to the *priores artium*, the citizenry of Florence, and the Archbishop Angelo Acciajuoli, demanding Gautier's release (Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 75; Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 330–31, cols. 126–27; and esp. Guerrieri, "Nuovi Documenti . . .," *Arch. stor. ital.*, XXI [1898], 298–300, who also gives the texts [pp. 304–5]). On Gautier's expulsion from Florence, note the *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, I, 12, in L. A. Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ*, III (Milan, 1740, repr. Bologna, 1965), cols. 343–53, where the accompanying Latin text is a translation.

The Acciajuoli failed in 1343, and in February, 1344, they could not meet their indebtedness to the Apostolic Camera (Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 654, col. 321, and no. 689,

Europe had the financial jitters, and the most prominent banking houses in Florence would soon go under; one might have thought that it was a poor time to launch a crusade, but the need was great, and Pope Clement was determined. On 8 August, 1343, he dispatched nine letters from Villeneuve-lès-Avignon to princes and others who would be the most concerned in the expedition. Foremost among these letters was that addressed to the Doge Bartolommeo (called Bertuccio) Gradenigo of Venice, who (oddly enough) had died the preceding 28 December, and been succeeded on 4 January by the young chronicler Andrea Dandolo. There had been a slip somewhere in the papal chancery, but Dandolo received the pope's letter. Clement understood fully, he wrote, that Venice was committed to five galleys for an armada which now seemed to be planned for twenty, *licet plures esse debere credamus*. Venice had such a large stake in the Morea and the islands that the pope wanted the Republic to contribute at least six well-armed galleys, not counting a galley which was to be furnished by the Venetian colony at Negroponte, where the armada was to gather on the coming feast of All Saints (1 November). Clement stated that besides the *spiritualia subsidia* that he had decreed to assist the expedition, he had granted *certa temporalia* from the already overburdened Apostolic Camera.¹⁰¹ The Senate replied on 16 September, however, "cum omni humilitate et devotione qua possumus," that they had agreed to furnish only a fourth part of the armada, and because of their other com-

mitments they had to excuse themselves from enlarging upon the offer they had previously made.¹⁰²

Like the other recipients of the letters dated on 8 August, Hugh IV of Cyprus was directed to make certain that the four galleys he had offered assembled with the rest of the armada at Negroponte on the feast of All Saints.¹⁰³ The Hospitallers were reminded that a special obligation fell upon them to protect Christians in the Levant, and Clement demanded six galleys of them in accordance with arrangements he had already made with representatives of the Order when they were in Avignon.¹⁰⁴ Clement also informed the master Hélon de Villeneuve that the needed reform of the Order was long overdue. Clerics and laymen alike were constantly grumbling about the Hospitallers' fine horses, rich food, sumptuous dress, gold and silver vessels and other precious ornaments, hawks and dogs, hunting expeditions, and abundant funds. He stated that the Hospitallers had hardly distinguished themselves by their

cols. 349-50); in August Clement VI agreed to allow them to pay up at the rate of 1,000 florins a year (*ibid.*, I, fasc. 2 [1925], no. 1042bis, cols. 142-43). It is interesting to note that the Florentine banking houses owed the Apostolic Camera little or nothing at the time of their failures. The largest debt, that of the Acciajuoli, amounted to only 11,475 florins, on which see Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378* (1941), pp. 583-94. The Acciajuoli owed the cardinal of Sabina 7,000 florins; their failure to reimburse him brought an interdict upon Florence in 1346-1347 (*ibid.*, pp. 589-90, 592).

¹⁰¹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 2^v-3^r, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 49^v-50^r, with two brief quotations from the document in Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 137, pp. 265-66; a very inadequate notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 336, col. 128; and cf. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. iv, no. 53, p. 124. Reg. Vat. 157 is a handsome, bulky volume. Reg. Vat. 62 contains "littere seu scripture tangentes negotia Tartarorum parcium ultramarinarum et infidelium ac scismaticorum tempore fe. re. Clementis V, Johannis XXII, Benedicti XII et Clementis VI per eosdem misse et recepte" (fol. 1^r).

¹⁰² Misti, Reg. 21, fols. 63^v-64^r; Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 158, p. 53: ". . . Et quia iuxta oblationem nostram de supradicta armata viginti galearum, quinque nos tangunt pro parte nostra, consulitur quod armentur quinque galee. . . ." Deliberations of the Senate on 18 September (1343) suggest that the Republic was going to be rather hard pressed to find money to get five galleys ready in the Arsenal (Reg. 21, fol. 64^v). On the same day the Grand Council set about the election of a captain for the five galleys, and Pietro Zeno was elected soon thereafter (Sp. M. Theotokes, *Ἀποφάσεις Μείζονος Συμβουλίου Βενετίας [1255-1669]*, Athens, 1933, docs. 24-25, pp. 124-25, in the *Μνημεία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας*, I-2). He thus received his command in September, not in November or December, as stated by Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 185.

Letters drafted and passed as resolutions in the various "councils" of the Venetian state (especially the Maggior Consiglio, the Senate, and the Collegio) were dispatched to their addressees as letters of the doge, but I have usually designated them as emanating from the council in which the texts were formulated.

¹⁰³ Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 1^v-2^r, and Reg. Vat. 62, fol. 48^r, with a brief notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 332, col. 127: ". . . volens etiam tuis et regni tui periculis precavere, volebas et offerebas quatuor galeas bene munitas et armatas ad dictas partes contra Turchos eosdem in succursum dictorum fidelium destinare. . . ."

¹⁰⁴ Reg. Vat. 157, fol. 3^r, and Reg. Vat. 62, fol. 50^r, with a notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 337, col. 128: "Ac propterea [cum] ad defensionem fidelium et partium predictarum situs pre aliis ex debito strictius obligati, nonnullos priores et alias personas vestri ordinis tunc in Curia Romana presentes ad nostram presentiam propter hoc duximus evocandos et deliberatione super hiis habita cum eisdem ordinavimus cum ipsis quod vos per hac vice sex galeas oportunis armis et gentibus armaretis per vos ad dictam Nigropontis insulam in festo huius destinandas. . . ."

alms-giving, and that their goods existed solely for the protection of their fellow Christians, especially those in the Levant. Various persons had urged him to create another military order (*alia militaris ordo*) and to endow it with part of the Hospitallers' possessions, for the virtuous rivalry of two such orders in the Levant, as formerly the Hospitallers and Templars had vied with each other, would redound to the large advantage of eastern Christendom. Clement had not yielded to these arguments, however, being confident that the Hospitallers would themselves bring about the desired reform. The growing severity of Turkish raids and the loss of Christian life were breaking his heart, he said, and now an armada of twenty galleys was being prepared for service against the Turks. Perhaps the entire armada should be paid for by the Hospitallers, since many people claimed that they had more treasure than the rest of the Church. In the meantime Clement would settle for the reform of the Order and six galleys.¹⁰⁵

Papal admonitions were often harsh in tone, and the masters of the military orders had received them before. Despite the machinations of curial politicians and others who resented their wealth and arrogance, the Hospitallers were not about to go the way of the Templars. Two weeks later, on 24 August (1343), Clement VI wrote Hélon de Villeneuve that the Hospital was to disburse the funds, which it was receiving from the Apostolic Camera, to the captains of the four galleys which the Holy See was maintaining in eastern waters for one year against the Turks. Clement did not wish the crusade to fail for any *defectus solutionis* on his part. The captains were to receive 12,800 florins for the first four months, and 25,600 for the remaining eight months (to be paid in two installments). Martino Zaccaria, the adventurous Genoese, was to command the papal galleys under the guidance of Henry d'Asti, the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, who was to accompany the expedition as the apostolic legate.¹⁰⁶ On 31 August Clem-

ent officially designated Henry d'Asti as his legate *pro quibusdam magnis et arduis negotiis ad partes Romanie*, and notified the archbishops of Nicosia, Crete, Patras, Athens, Thebes, Corinth, Rhodes, Naxos, Corfu, Durazzo, Lepanto, and Neopatras, their suffragans, prelates, and other secular and regular clergy over whom the eastern legation was to extend.¹⁰⁷ Martino Zaccaria was appointed captain-general of the four papal galleys *usque ad nostrum beneplacitum* on 16 September,¹⁰⁸ on which day the pope also gave Henry d'Asti authority to remove Zaccaria from his post and to appoint another in his stead if the need should arise.¹⁰⁹

Although Clement VI pushed on with the *negotium Terrae Sanctae* in more determined fashion than his Avignonese predecessors, both John XXII and Benedict XII had maintained four galleys in the Aegean for some time

parently intended for wages and food (for about 200 men per galley?), and was to be administered by the legate (Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 435, cols. 182–83). By 20 October (1343) the Apostolic Camera had disbursed 40,800 florins for the pope's galleys (and a few gifts to Greek envoys and others), not counting the 12,800 florins provided for the first four months of service, which (as I understand the accounts) means an expenditure of some 53,600 florins to get the crusade under way (Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 464, col. 203), and thereafter the costs mounted steadily, as we shall see.

¹⁰⁷ Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 4^r–5^v; inadequate notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 340, col. 129, and see nos. 388–90, 406 ff.; Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, doc. CLXXXI, pp. 232–34.

¹⁰⁸ Reg. Vat. 62, fol. 40^r, and Reg. Vat. 137, fols. 102^v–103^r, with a notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 404, col. 171.

¹⁰⁹ Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 40^r–40^v, and Reg. Vat. 137, fols. 103^r–103^v; Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 405, col. 171: "Venerabili fratri Henrico patriarche Constantinopolitano in partibus transmarinis apostolice sedis legato: . . . Si forsan dictum capitaneum amoveri ab officio capitaneatus huiusmodi vel deficere aut alio impedimento notabili detineri contingeret, tu alium capitaneum quem ad hoc ydoneum et sufficientem credideris auctoritate nostra quociens oportunum extiterit usque ad nostrum beneplacitum, nisi per nos tunc ordinatum esset aliud, valeas deputare plenam fraternitati tue concedimus tenore presentium facultatem. Tu vero sic te prudenter et modeste gerere studeas in hac parte. . . . Datum apud Villamnovam Avinionensis diocesis XVI Kal. Octobris anno secundo." As happens rather too frequently, Déprez does not give the text. The legate was not to allow the fleet to be diverted or delayed (Reg. Vat. 62, fol. 41^r, and Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 104^r): "Volentes quod galearum stolum . . . , postquam iter arripuerit, a recto tramite nullatenus divertatur, fraternitati tue . . . mandamus quatinus . . . dictum stolum ad portum vel locum aliquem declinare vel deviare a recto itinere vel retardari quomolibet non permittas" (with a notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 409, col. 172).

¹⁰⁵ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 341, cols. 129–32.

¹⁰⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 368–69, cols. 150–52. The pope's initial commitment, therefore, appears to have been not 37,800 florins (as given in Déprez's rubric) but 38,400 (almost half the amount which Clement VI paid for the city of Avignon five years later). The cost of fitting out and arming the four galleys had already been met, and so 3,200 florins a month for keeping four galleys in service (i.e., 800 a month for each) seems about right. The money was ap-

against the Turks.¹¹⁰ Clement was to keep his galleys at sea for two years, and the *exitus* accounts of his reign in the Vatican Archives show that they eventually cost him almost 200,000 florins!¹¹¹

Few compilations of data relating to the economic history of the fourteenth century are more striking than the military and naval expenditures of the Avignonese papacy. John XXII's total expenditures over the eighteen years of his reign amounted to 4,191,466 florins, which exceeded the papal income by more than 90,000 florins, but the books were kept in comfortable balance by John's employing over 445,000 florins from the papal "privy purse" and by recovering some 150,000 florins from the injudicious bequests of his predecessor Clement V. John spent about 63.7 per cent of his "budget" (if we may so call it) for warfare, especially in seeking to reassert papal supremacy over the Italian vicariates in opposition to the claims of the Emperor Ludwig of Bavaria, the Visconti, and the ambitious lordlings of northern Italy, who preferred to be imperial rather than papal "vicars." From 1321 to 1331 John's military expenses are said to have reached 2,390,433 florins, spent mostly on the Italian wars. The austere Benedict XII, whose average annual expenditures amounted to less than half of John's, concentrated upon charity and the construction of the new palace at Avignon, and spent only 5.6 per cent of his income for warfare. To some extent Clement VI resumed John's Italian policy, and spent something under 21 per cent of his income *pro guerra* on land and sea, and a fair part of this was of course accounted for by the crusade.¹¹² Nevertheless, the generous Clem-

ent devoted some 17 per cent of his total "budget" to charitable purposes throughout the decade of his reign, and spent more than 52,000 gold florins *pro elemosina* during the pestilential year 1347-1348 (when only 5 per cent went *pro guerra*).¹¹³ Clement's income, as we noted above, averaged about 188,500 florins a year. His successor, Innocent VI, spent 797,705 florins on the Italian wars from 1353 to 1360, which Schäfer estimates to have been about 40 per cent of his total income for these years.¹¹⁴ Urban V spent some 8.32 per cent of his income for war, and Gregory XI, the last of the Avignonese popes before the Schism, about 41.60 per cent.¹¹⁵ The warfare which attended Gregory's return to Rome is well known.

We have already observed that the titular Latin Empress Catherine of Valois-Courtenay had recently spent two and a half years in the Morea (1338-1341), and when Clement VI wrote her (on 8 August, 1343), he began by noting that she had seen with her own eyes Turkish depredation in Greece. She had promised two galleys whenever a Christian crusading fleet might be formed, and Clement now wanted her to see to it that her young

a total of about 21.80 per cent, of which the largest part went into the crusade and the Italian wars. See Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben d. Apost. Kammer unter Johann XXII.* (1911), introd., pp. 13-14, 31-32, 36-37, and the accounts given on pp. 335-81, 404-5, 410-11, 423-24, 433-36, 448-52, 461-62, etc., on John XXII's military expenditures; *Die Ausgaben unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI.* (1914), pp. 178-79, 182, on the establishment of Clement VI's military budget as almost 21 percent of his income. On the heavy burden of the Italian wars, see also Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon*, esp. pp. 169-85, who gives (pp. 32 ff.) convenient tables of the receipts and expenditures of the Apostolic Camera from 1316 to 1378, and notes that the registers of *Introitus et Exitus* are the cash accounts of the treasury and in many ways not a full statement of papal income and expenditures, which can hardly be assessed.

¹¹³ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 181-82. Clement VI's expenditures for charity were slightly exceeded by those of Benedict XII, which averaged 19.40 per cent (*ibid.*, p. 12), and cf. Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* (1962), pp. 409 ff.

¹¹⁴ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 519, 520, and cf. pp. 522, 524-26, 554-55, 572-75, 609-12, 648-50, 747-52, etc., 791-92, 811.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon*, pp. 32 ff., table II. Schäfer's third volume on the cameral accounts, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter den Päpsten Urban V. und Gregor XI. (1362-1378)*, Paderborn, 1937, lacks synoptic tables of expenditure of the sort he provided in his earlier volumes for the period from 1316 to 1362.

¹¹⁰ K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII. nebst den Jahresbilanzen von 1316-1375*, Paderborn, 1911, p. 379, and Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI. (1335-1362)*, Paderborn, 1914, p. 22. On John XXII's crusading expenditures up to 1334 and on the costs of maintaining the four galleys, see Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon*, pp. 166-69.

¹¹¹ Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI.*, pp. 170, 178-79, 182, 232, 257, 260, 263, 264. As commander of the pope's galleys Martino Zaccaria was paid 1,800 florins a year (*ibid.*, pp. 232, 263), and after his death his successor was to be paid the same amount (p. 264).

¹¹² Reckoning the totals and percentages of papal expenditures is not a simple matter. Under the earlier Avignonese popes there was no established rubric *pro guerra* (for which Clement VI spent 9.80 per cent of his income), and military expenses were commonly designated *pro cera et extraordinariis* (for which Clement spent 12 per cent), making

son Robert, prince of Achaea, kept the promise by sending two well-armed galleys to the rendezvous at Negroponte.¹¹⁶ A letter went off to Robert also, requesting the two galleys. Clement stated that for his part he was preparing the papal galleys which were to join the armada, and assured Robert of the heavenly rewards of the crusader, provided of course that he sent the galleys. Robert's contribution was a doubtful factor, and so the pope sent Archbishop Philip of Thebes (1342–1351), a Carmelite, to Naples as the *exhibitor presentium*; Philip, presumably a curial prelate, would bring Robert's answer back to Avignon.¹¹⁷ Philip was also the bearer of a papal letter of exhortation to Sancia, widow of the late King Robert (d. 19 January, 1343), who was to persuade the young Queen Joanna of Naples to make her contribution to the armada. Of course Clement did not fail to write to Joanna herself.¹¹⁸ It is hard to know how much Clement really expected of the Angevins. Joanna was still in her teens, and the kingdom was already being rent by internal discord.

The bigger the Christian armada, the better the chance of success. On 16 September Clement requested a galley from Giovanni I Sanudo, duke of the Archipelago, who had ap-

parently informed both Henry d'Asti and the Curia that he was willing to supply one.¹¹⁹ He sent similar requests on the same day to Giorgio II Ghisi, lord of Tenos and Mykonos and triarch of Negroponte, and to Balzana dalle Carceri-Gozzadini, regent for her son of two "thirds" of Negroponte, asking each of them for one armed galley. He also asked for appropriate contingents or subsidies from the Genoese (from whom aid was expected), Pisans, Perugians, Anconitans, Sienese, and Florentines, as well as from the Visconti of Milan, the Scaligeri of Verona, and the Pepoli of Bologna.¹²⁰ Probably some of them sent money, but there seems to be no evidence that any one of them actually sent a galley unless Giovanni Sanudo did so.¹²¹ There were, however, some prominent volunteers. Thus Edward, lord of Beaujeu in the diocese of Mâcon, had recently told Clement of the grief which stories of the Turkish oppression of Christians had caused him. Edward had declared himself ready to go to Rhodes with a body of armed men. On 23 September (1343) Clement recommended him to Hélon de Villeneuve, and granted him the privilege of a portable altar on the following day.¹²²

Preparations for a crusade included as always the attempt to allay the mutual hostilities of the Christian powers. Clement VI appealed to the Genoese, who were supposed to send a naval contingent to Negroponte, to refrain from any *novitas noxia* against Hugh IV of Cyprus.¹²³ He also tried to settle the long-standing dispute between Pedro IV of Aragon and James II of Majorca,¹²⁴ and of course to stem

¹¹⁶ Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 2^r–2^v, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 48^v–49^r, with a notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 334, col. 128: ". . . Cum igitur excellentia tua calamitates, oppressiones, dampna et iniurias fidelium partium predictarum [Romanie], cum moram in illis partibus contraxisti, oculo inspexeris et actu palpaveris et quod, quando terras dilecti filii nobilis viri Roberti principis Achaye filii tui regebas, super succursu dictis fidelibus exhibendo a prelati et alii dictarum partium requisita duas galeas, cum aliqua armata contra ipsos Turchos per Christianos fieret, gratanter obtuleris, . . . celsitudinem tuam requirimus . . . quatinus, miserum statum fidelium partium predictarum et necessitatem huiusmodi negotii pie commemorans, . . . ipsum principem omnibus viis et modis de quibus expedire cognoscis inducas efficaciter et horteris ut huiusmodi duas galeas bene munitas ad dictam insulam [Negropontis] in dicto festo tam ad pium sanctumque negotium et Dei obsequium submotis impedimentis quibuslibet debeat destinare cum predictis aliis contra prefatos paganos. . . . Datum apud Villamnovam Avinionensis diocesis VI Idus Augusti anno secundo."

¹¹⁷ Reg. Vat. 157, fol. 2^v, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 49^r–49^v, with the usual (insufficient) notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 335, col. 128; note Eubel, I, 430, 482, on Philip, who was translated from the see of Salona to that of Thebes on 26 August, 1342, and very likely never went to Greece. On 17 June, 1351, Philip was made archbishop of Conza in southern Italy (*ibid.*, I, 202–3). He died in 1356.

¹¹⁸ Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 2^r, 3^r, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 48^r–48^v, 50^r, and *cf.* Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 333, 338, cols. 127, 129.

¹¹⁹ Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 42^r–42^v, and Reg. Vat. 137, fols. 105^r–105^v; Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 414, col. 174.

¹²⁰ Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 42^v–43^r, and Reg. Vat. 137, fols. 105^v–106^r, with notices in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 415–17, cols. 174–75.

¹²¹ In listing the galleys which were to comprise the armada, Clement informed Hélon de Villeneuve (on 8 August, 1343) that there would be four from Cyprus, five from Venice, six from the Hospital, four from the Holy See, and one from the "heredes . . . quondam Nicolai Semici" (Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 341, col. 131). Giovanni I Sanudo had succeeded his brother Niccolò I as duke of the Archipelago in 1341, and it has been shrewdly suggested that *Semici* is a mistake for *Sanudi* (Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 184, note 1).

¹²² Reg. Vat. 137, fols. 108^r, 286^v–287^r; Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 421, 424, cols. 176, 178: ". . . nos tuis devotis supplicationibus inclinati ut liceat tibi habere altare portatile . . . indulgemus."

¹²³ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 360, col. 145.

¹²⁴ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 159–60, 167–68, 188, 220, 254, 256, 260, 295–96, 342, 352, 356–58, 374, 383, 444–45,

the impending tide of war which threatened to engulf France and England, and would bring English troops to the borders of the papal Comtat-Venaissin.¹²⁵ On 21 October (1343) he directed Henry d'Asti to make every effort to keep the peace between the Catalan Grand Company, which then occupied the old Burgundian duchy of Athens, and Gautier de Brienne,¹²⁶ who (having now been expelled from his brief lordship of Florence) might conceivably repeat his attempt of a dozen years before to assert his claim to the duchy which the Catalans had taken from his father by force of arms in the bloody battle of Halmyros in March, 1311. It seemed like a good time also to renew ties with the Greeks. Clement and the Curia "received benignly," from envoys from Constantinople, letters written in the name of the young Emperor John V Palaeologus, who could never fail to interest a pope when the question of church union arose. These envoys also wanted to discuss the expedition against the Turks, and they probably had something to say about Umur Pasha of Aydin, whose entente with Cantacuzenus the Palaeologian court wished to disrupt.¹²⁷

These were also the years in which the Basilian monk Barlaam, who was born at Seminara in Calabria, was employed on diplomatic missions between Avignon and Constantinople. As an envoy of the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus III, Barlaam had already tried to explain to the Curia in 1339 the reasons for the Greeks' bitter hatred and enduring

suspicion of the Latins. He had emphasized that church union could be effected only on the basis of a mutual understanding which was sadly lacking. An expedition against the Turks to ward off the danger they presented to Constantinople would help to mitigate that hatred and go far to remove the Greeks' suspicion that the Latins sought territorial aggrandizement at their expense. In 1346 Barlaam was to return to the Bosphorus as Clement VI's own envoy, presumably to explore the possibilities of church union at the pro-Catholic court of the dowager Empress Anna of Savoy and her son John V, but the hesychasts under Gregory Palamas, religious nationalists as well as mystics, were violently opposed to church union. During the years of his residence in Constantinople, where he had become abbot of the monastery of S. Salvator (some time before 1331), Barlaam had already clashed with the hesychasts, whose feverish mysticism he had ridiculed, but they had recently secured a victory for their doctrines and the rejection of Barlaam's criticism at a council held in Hagia Sophia (in June, 1341). After a few years' eclipse the hesychasts would regain their power and prominence, and form a political alliance with Cantacuzenus against the Palaeologian court. The condemnation of Barlaam would be renewed in the Greek capital shortly before Cantacuzenus's triumphant re-entry into the city early in February, 1347.¹²⁸ In the meantime, of course, Clement VI was pushing forward his plans for a crusade to protect Latin interests in the Levant.

Having formally requested the Venetians to receive the crews and commanders of the Christian armada and to make provisions available to them in the eastern ports of the Republic,¹²⁹ Clement ordered the crusade to be

583 ff., and 744, but the pope's efforts came to nothing, because Pedro IV was determined to move against Majorca (*ibid.*, nos. 773, 809-11, 820, and fasc. 2 [1925], nos. 896-97, 1024, 1218, 1366, 1384, 1398, etc., and on the background, see Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* [1949], pp. 427-32, with bibliography *ibid.*, pp. 436-37).

¹²⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 94-96, 176, 315, 326-29, 363, 420, 439-40, 448-52, 581, 593-95, 617, 697, 743, 759, 775, 812, and fasc. 2 (1925), nos. 920, 1039, 1043, 1108, 1155 ff., 1304 ff., 1322 ff. On 20 June, 1344, Clement forgave Philip VI the use of tithes (in defense of the French kingdom) which had been conceded and collected for the liberation of the Holy Land (Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 914, cols. 54-59).

¹²⁷ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 465, cols. 204-5, and cf. fasc. 2, no. 1608, cols. 482-84, dated 1 April, 1345.

¹²⁸ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 464 (gifts to the envoys from Greece), 466-70, 471, 490-93, 522-23, 547; see also Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 182-83; Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (1904), pp. 43-54; and G. Presutti, "Fr. Fortanerio Vassalli, O.M., in una minuta di bolla del papa Clemente VI all' imperatore d' Oriente Giovanni Paleologo," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum*, VI (1913), 705-9.

¹²⁹ Setton, "Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, vol. 100 (1956), 40 ff., with refs. to the sources. Reference to hesychasm will recall to the reader various works by Jean Meyendorff.

¹³⁰ Reg. Vat. 62, fol. 41^v, and Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 104^v; with a brief notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 410, cols. 172-73: ". . . quatinus cum ad portus vel loca vobis subiecta iter suum huiusmodi prosequendo pro refrigerio et victualibus recipiendis declinaverint [capitanei et patroni alique navigantes in eodem galearum stolio] eos benigne recommendatos habentes ipsos dictasque galeas per vos et subditos vestros benigne recipere ac tractare favorabiliter ut nullum nocivum impedimentum habere in hac parte valeant sic prompte ac benivole pro divina et apostolice sedis reverencia procuretis quod inde possit vestra devocio merito commendari" (letter dated 16 September,

preached throughout Europe and the Christian Levant, by the bull *Insurgentibus contra fidem* (dated 30 September, 1343), which proclaimed the usual grant of indulgences for those who now fought against the "gentes illorum infidelium paganorum que vulgari lingua Turchi vocantur." The Turks' naval strength and unspeakable audacity had grown with the years. They were destroying and depopulating the Latin states in the East. They sold their Christian captives as though they were animals, and forced them to abjure their faith. The Turkish raids upon Negroponte and the other islands in the Aegean had been a nightmare of fire and slaughter, plunder and enslavement.¹³⁰ The text is eloquent. Clement probably had a hand in its composition.

On 1 December, 1343, a three years' tithe was imposed upon ecclesiastical benefices in some sixty or more provinces both in Europe and in the Levant.¹³¹ The continuing dissension between Hugh IV of Cyprus and the Genoese was worrisome,¹³² but plans for the expedition were pushed forward by the Curia. Clement appointed Venturino da Bergamo, a Dominican, to preach the crusade in the rich province of Milan, where it was hoped the generous concession of indulgences would gain recruits to the cross, because (as Clement wrote Giovanni Visconti, archbishop of Milan, on 4 January,

1343). The Venetian Senate replied favorably on 9 October (Misti, Reg. 21, fol. 68^v).

¹³⁰ Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 7^r–7^v, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 52^r–53^r; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. iv, no. 66, p. 127; with an inadequate notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 433, col. 181: "... illam suorum peccaminum de quibus veraciter fuerint corde contriti et ore confessi veniam indulgemus que conceditur transfretantibus in subsidium Terre Sancte et in retributionem iustorum salutis eterne pollicemur augmentum." The bull received the widest possible distribution in Europe (Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 7–8^v, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 53^v–55^r) as well as throughout the Christian East (Reg. Vat. 161, fols. 2^v–3^r; Reg. Vat. 215, fols. 3^v–4^v; and Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 434, col. 181). On the Turkish attack upon Negroponte, see also the *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, I, 13, in Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ*, III (1740, repr. 1965), 355E, 357A.

¹³¹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 157, fols. 16^v–18^v, and Reg. Vat. 62, fols. 55^r–57^r; with a notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 559, col. 264; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I (1880, repr. 1965), no. 140, pp. 269–73; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. iv, no. 100, p. 134. Although exempted from the tithe as usual, the Hospitallers were also taxed for the crusade, apparently above and beyond the amounts they had spent in fitting out their six galleys (Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 711, cols. 363–64, dated 4 March, 1344).

¹³² Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 575, col. 278, and fasc. 2 (1925), no. 833, cols. 1–3.

1344) the ravaging hostility of the Turks required the more rapid advancement of preparations for the crusade.¹³³

In Venice, Rhodes, and Cyprus the work of preparation went on through the winter. The pope's own galleys were partly fitted out in Zaccaria's native city of Genoa, whence Clement had hoped for aid which probably never came. In fact, while his galleys were in Ligurian waters, Genoese sailors had signed up and taken the usual oath "to sail and serve for a set period in the galleys which we have sent to Romania to assist the faithful against the Turks," and having received advances on their wages, they had calmly (*latenter et furtive*) deserted the galleys. On 8 May, 1344, Clement appealed to the Genoese government, the seneschal of Provence and Forcalquier, and the archbishop of Genoa to see to it that the papal funds were recovered from the miscreants, who were not only imperilling their souls but impeding the defense of eastern Christendom.¹³⁴

According to the contemporary chronicle of the Paduan judge Guglielmo Cortusi, on Ascension day (13 May, 1344) the Christian fleet burned and sank fifty-two Turkish vessels (*ligna*),¹³⁵ and Cantacuzenus informs us that the fleet, which he says contained twenty-four galleys (*τρίηρεις*), burned sixty ships which the Turks had had to abandon at an inlet called Longus on Pallene, the western prong of the Chalcidic peninsula.¹³⁶ It is presumably this epi-

¹³³ Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 166^v, with full notice in Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 591, col. 288. The region of Patras suffered from heavy Turkish raids, possibly at this time (*ibid.*, fasc. 2 [1925], no. 1215, col. 254, doc. dated 3 November, 1344).

¹³⁴ Déprez, I, fasc. 1, nos. 815–17, cols. 431–33.

¹³⁵ *Guillelmi de Cortusiis chronica de novitatibus Padue et Lombardie*, ed. Beniamino Pagnin, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XII, pt. 5 (1941), pref., and in the old edition, *Historia Cortusiorum*, *RISS*, XII (1728), col. 914AB. Muratori had assigned this chronicle to the joint authorship of Guglielmo Cortusi (who was still living at a very advanced age in 1361) and his great-grandnephew Albrigetto (who was born in 1388 and was still living in 1454), but Pagnin has shown in the preface to the (unfinished) new edition of the chronicle that it is the work of Guglielmo alone. See also the notes of Ester Pastorello to *Raphayni de Caresinis. . . Chronica aa. 1343–1388*, in *RISS*, XII-2 (1922), 3–4, but the account of the expedition to Smyrna in Caresini, who continued the Doge Andrea Dandolo's chronicle, is apparently a later addition.

¹³⁶ Cantacuzenus, *Hist.*, III, 68 (Bonn, II, 422–23), on which see Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 187–89. Cortusi also puts the Christian victory "in pelago Montis Sancti, ubi est monasterium, in quo sunt monachi MD caloceri nominati" (*op. cit.*, in *RISS*, XII [1728], 914B).

sode which led Clement VI on 25 July to congratulate the master Hélon de Villeneuve—*fecisti viriliter et potenter*—upon the support he was giving the legate Henry d'Asti on the latter's crusading mission.¹³⁷ On 12 August Clement thanked the Doge Andrea Dandolo for informing him of a Christian victory over the Turks "in these past days,"¹³⁸ which seems to be a further reference to the Latin success at Pallene. He hoped that the fleet might also assist the Armenians, who had suffered much from the Turks.¹³⁹ On 18 September he warned Henry d'Asti not to allow Martino Zaccaria, former lord of Chios (1314–1329), to try to repossess the island, which would drive the Byzantine government from a reunion with Rome to an alliance with the Turks.¹⁴⁰

Since the collection of the crusading tithe might possibly be late, and it had up until then been impossible to find merchants or others through whom large amounts of cash could be safely sent, Clement wanted Hélon de Villeneuve and the Hospitallers to advance, if it should prove necessary, four months' expenses for the papal galleys, which we know amounted to 12,800 florins. If the advance were made, the sum would soon be repaid in full to the Hospital.¹⁴¹ Four and a half months later (on 1 February, 1345), Clement wrote Hélon de Villeneuve again, complaining that the Hospitallers had never answered his request,¹⁴² although by then the crusade was almost over, and had achieved almost spectacular results.

In fact the Smyrniote crusade was a surprising success. Umur Pasha was caught off guard, almost without any guard. Gregoras says that

the Latins launched an attack with twenty-seven ships upon the piratical Turks, who had been preying upon Aegean shipping for years (πειρατικόν τινα βίον καὶ ληστρικὸν ἀναμετροῦντες). The Christian fleet consisted of Cypriotes, Rhodians, Salaminians (Negropontines?), and Venetians together with the forces which the pope and (according to Gregoras) the Genoese had provided. Their descent upon Smyrna was sudden and unexpected; they took the harbor fortress and roadstead apparently on the first assault. Gregoras adds that the Latins intended to use Smyrna as a beachhead (ὀρμητήριον) from which to sally forth and drive the Turks from the Anatolian littoral, "but matters hardly proceeded thereafter in accord with their expectations."¹⁴³ Cantacuzenus's account puts Umur Pasha in Smyrna at the time of the attack: "Twenty-four Latin galleys, which the Rhodians and others had got ready, sailed against Smyrna, took the fortress at the harborside, and set no few Turkish ships on fire. Umur was on hand, and defended himself as best he could, but lacked the strength to win out over the Latin force—so to this day the Latins hold the port of Smyrna."¹⁴⁴

The news of the Christian victory was promptly transmitted to Venice, whence the Doge Andrea Dandolo wrote Clement VI, who replied on 23 December, 1344, delighted to learn of the "triumphal and victorious capture of that strong and important castle of Smyrna, together with the seaport and [its] fortifications, and the defeat of the people of the stinking Turkish nation . . . on the feast of the blessed apostles Simon and Jude [28 October, 1344],"¹⁴⁵ thus supplying the date which is lacking in the Byzantine chronicles. On the same day Clement sent the happy news to the king and queen of France and to the duke of Normandy,¹⁴⁶ and on 13 January, 1345, he wrote Marie, the wife of Edward, lord of Beaujeu, informing her of the valor her husband had displayed in the signal success which the crusaders had achieved at Smyrna.¹⁴⁷ Two days later he wrote Humbert II, dauphin of Viennois,

¹³⁷ Déprez, I, fasc. 2 (1925), no. 987, col. 108. Henry d'Asti had written the pope of the "fortunate progress" of their affairs (*ibid.*, no. 988).

¹³⁸ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1027, cols. 130–31.

¹³⁹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1087, col. 164. On the relations of the Holy See with Cilician Armenia, see Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, pp. 133–50.

¹⁴⁰ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1113, cols. 185–86. On the Zaccaria family in Old Phocaea and Chios, see Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, I, 446, 461–64, and *cf.* Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes* (1873), geneal. table, p. 502. Clement thought it might prove desirable to replace Zaccaria as commander of the papal galleys (Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 1114, col. 187). On Zaccaria's early career, note Ludovico Gatto, "Per la Storia di Martino Zaccaria, signore di Chio," *Bullettino dell' "Archivio paleografico italiano,"* new series, II–III (1956–57), 325–45, with five documents from 1318–1319 and 1323.

¹⁴¹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1114–15, cols. 186–88, dated 18 September, 1344.

¹⁴² Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1463, col. 401, and *cf.* no. 1464.

¹⁴³ Gregoras, XIII, 13, 7 (Bonn, II, 689).

¹⁴⁴ Cantacuzenus, III 68 (Bonn, II, 419–20); Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 190.

¹⁴⁵ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1350, cols. 335–36; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 150, p. 286; and *cf.* Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 149, p. 144.

¹⁴⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1351, col. 336.

¹⁴⁷ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1395, cols. 361–63.

in another connection, but took the opportunity to tell him of the Christian victory over "[O]marbassanus" (Umur Pasha), the chief ruler of the Turks; the Patriarch Henry d'Asti planned to reside for a while in the harbor fortress at Smyrna, where he was adding to the defenses, and from which he hoped "to acquire many other infidel lands in the region thereabouts."¹⁴⁸ Finally, on 1 February, Edward III of England was officially informed of the victory, more than five weeks after Philip VI had been notified.¹⁴⁹ Clement congratulated Henry d'Asti (also on 1 February) a bit belatedly, perhaps, and exhorted him to continue as *virtuose, constanter et intrepide* as he had begun. He reminded Henry at some length of his financial difficulties. It was very hard to find merchants through whom large sums could be sent to the Levant, and now it was especially so, "because . . . in those parts one cannot profitably navigate during the winter season." Henry was to disburse funds with extreme care and to consider whether the size of the crews on the papal galleys might not be reduced to save money without endangering the success of the enterprise. Clement was far more anxious, however, for the continued advance of the crusade than for the curtailment of expenses. Henry would know best what to do, having been well taught in the school of experience (*in scola experientie*). Although Clement had heard with immense satisfaction of the many accomplishments of the Christian fleet, he was not aware of any notable performance on the part of Martino Zaccaria. Henry was to decide whether, when the year was over, it might not be advisable to replace him with some other commander.¹⁵⁰

The Christians had succeeded in taking only the harbor of Smyrna and the fortress by the waterfront. The hilltop fortifications (the "acropolis") were still in Turkish hands, and indeed they remained so. Between the Turks on the height and the Christians below was a "labyrinth of deserted houses." The crusaders lived in an atmosphere of almost daily crisis. They helped the Venetians to wall in a shoreline suburb outside the fortress, digging out around

the new wall a moat which gave access directly to the sea. Merchants flocked into the suburb, a monetary exchange was established, and shops were set up under the lee of the new wall.¹⁵¹ Since Umur Pasha lived largely by piracy, he found exclusion from the sea as intolerable as the proximity of his enemies. He bombarded the lower fortress with mangonels, but the Turkish chronicler Enveri describes in his *Düstürnâme* an apparently successful Latin sortie, which broke the siege for a while and destroyed the Turkish mangonels.¹⁵²

The Patriarch Henry d'Asti now wanted to celebrate mass (presumably to commemorate the Christian success) in a large abandoned church, which the Turks had converted into a stable, in the no-man's-land between the harbor fortress and the Turkish-held acropolis. Cantacuzenus says that Martino Zaccaria and the patriarch had lately returned to Smyrna with a dozen galleys, possibly from a foray to secure supplies. We may assume that it was their arrival which lifted the Turkish siege. He also says that the church in question was the former metropolis of Smyrna (*ἐν ᾗ πάλαι ἡ μητρόπολις ἦν*), and that Zaccaria and the other commanders objected to the patriarch's gesture as being too dangerous. Henry d'Asti, however, was leader of the host; they all had to follow him; and he was at the altar when Umur Pasha descended upon the church. At the approach of the Turks, the bulk of the Latin forces fled to the refuge of the harbor fortress, but Henry d'Asti, Zaccaria, the Venetian commander Pietro Zeno, and a few other important persons, who were in the church, were all slain.¹⁵³ The disaster occurred on S. Anthony's day, 17 January, 1345.¹⁵⁴ On that

¹⁵¹ *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, I, 13, in Muratori, *Antiquitates italicae*, III, cols. 357, 359, 365C: "ne lo laberinto de le deserte case."

¹⁵² Trans. Mélikoff-Sayar (1954), p. 116 and note.

¹⁵³ Cantacuzenus, III, 95 (Bonn, II, 582-83); Guglielmo Cortusi, in *RİSS*, XII (1728), col. 914CD; and see Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 190-91.

¹⁵⁴ The author of the *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, in Muratori, *Antiquitates italicae*, III, cols. 363, 365, 367, seems to be well informed, at least concerning the stories that were later current in Italy. He identifies the church, see of the ancient *vescovato* of Smyrna, as that of S. John, which he sets at two catapult shots (*da doi valsestrate*) outside the recently built wall, and says that forty nobles and officers were killed as well as the patriarch, whom he identifies as Emanuele da Ca Marino, who however was never patriarch of Constantinople (nor of Grado nor of Aquileia). The author gives two accounts of the events of S. Anthony's day. The first corresponds roughly to that in Cantacuzenus,

¹⁴⁸ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1397, cols. 365-66.

¹⁴⁹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1462, cols. 398-401.

¹⁵⁰ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1464, cols. 401-4. Zaccaria had first been appointed captain-general of the papal galleys between 18 and 28 September, 1343 (*cf.*, above, note 102, and see Theotokes, *op. cit.*, doc. no. 25, p. 125).

very day alms had been given to the convents of the Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, and Carmelites in Avignon, "for the procession held on 16 January in the house of the Preachers on account of the victory obtained by the Christian faithful against the Turks. . . ." ¹⁵⁵ Such are the tricks of fortune.

Before the bad news had arrived from the East, a small contingent of troops was preparing to set out (on 6 March) under Pierre de la Palu, lord of Varambon and royal seneschal of Beaucaire, ¹⁵⁶ and their services would clearly be needed if the Christians were to hold the lower fortress at Smyrna. By the middle of March, Clement VI knew of the disaster of S. Anthony's day. On the seventeenth he wrote

but the second, which he prefers (and which allegedly came on oath from an eyewitness), is to the effect that the Patriarch Emanuele finished the mass and delivered an elegant sermon, inciting the Christians against the Turks. There were said to be 15,000 Christians in the host. After the sermon the patriarch put on rich and elaborate armor, and sword in hand mounted a gallant steed to set off against the Turks, accompanied by Zeno and Zaccaria. They advanced too far ahead of the host, and unattended even by officers, they fell into a Turkish ambush, were slain, decapitated, and stripped of their armor. The Turks "left their bodies naked upon the ground" (col. 365D). When the crusaders discovered the bodies, they gave way to grief and lamentation, but (as we shall see) the Christians did not discover the bodies, which the Turks carried off. Although the author professes to have first-hand information (*Aicuno me dice . . . , Disse chi lo vide personalmente*, col. 363E; *Disseme uno, lo quale tutte queste cose vide*, col. 367D), his account is a compound of more fiction than fact, and unfortunately it is not easy always to draw a line between the two, on which note Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 187–88, note 4, and pp. 192–93, note 4, who calls attention to certain other western sources of dubious value.

¹⁵⁵ Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI.* (1914), p. 263. During the spring and summer of 1345 Umur Pasha, leaving the Latins huddled behind the walls of the fortress of the lower town at Smyrna, joined John Cantacuzenus in a campaign in Thrace, on which see Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 204–17.

¹⁵⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1524–30, 1623, cols. 432–34, 488. Pierre de la Palu left for the East with Philip VI's permission, on which note Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (1904), pp. 58–59. On 10 April, 1345, by which time he had already departed, Clement VI requested that Pierre be allowed to retain the *sénéchaussée* of Beaucaire during his absence (Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 1639, cols. 499–500). Pierre was, incidentally, well known to the Venetians (Misti, Reg. 22, fol. 1^r, doc. dated 2 March, 1344). There were probably fair numbers of volunteers like Pierre. Thus we hear of Robert Bradeston and John of S. Philibert (two Englishmen on their way to fight the Turks) only because they were imprisoned in Pisa when a Pisan ship (*vulgo cocha*) was detained by the English government: Clement VI asked the Pisans for their release on 5 April, 1345 (Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 1617, col. 486).

Hélión de Villeneuve of his terrible distress, and informed him that he was designating Raymond Saquet, bishop of Théroutanne, as the new legate and Bertrand des Baux, lord of Courthezon (*de Cortedono*), as captain-general of the four papal galleys. Hélión was to console the leaderless forces at Smyrna and to take every possible step to safeguard the gains which the crusade had made. ¹⁵⁷ According to Giovanni Villani, when the plight of the crusaders became known in the West, 400 men *segnati di croce* from Florence, some 350 from Siena, and various others from Tuscany and Lombardy made their way eastward by way of Venice "at the expense of the Church and of the pope." ¹⁵⁸ In any event the future of the crusade depended upon some measure of tranquillity in western Europe. Papal efforts to keep the peace between France and England were faring badly. Clement frankly warned Philip VI to take the necessary steps to protect himself lest he be caught unprepared. He also sent Philip secret advices which he had received from England, ¹⁵⁹ which was hardly in accord with the neutrality which the Curia professed.

Bishop Raymond and Bertrand des Baux did not set out for the East, despite Clement's desire that they should do so, ¹⁶⁰ for the war between France and England was being resumed in earnest. Philip VI did not wish the general crusading indulgence to be extended to France. He declined to grant permission to Raymond and Bertrand to assume the charges

¹⁵⁷ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1570, cols. 462–63. The doge of Venice had transmitted the news of S. Anthony's day to Avignon. The pope assured the prior of the Hospital in Lombardy, the Negropontines, and others that every effort would be made "ad reparandum, quantum nobis est possibile, quod cecidit" (*ibid.*, nos. 1571–72). At the same time Clement wrote the doge, "We know, my son, that you would more gladly send us good news than bad if the facts could only meet with your prayers," and notified him of the appointments of Raymond Saquet and Bertrand des Baux (no. 1569). On the following day (18 March) he wrote Edward III of England, giving him the news and urging him to remain at peace with France in order that the war against the Turks might be carried on to a successful conclusion (no. 1582, and note no. 1590).

¹⁵⁸ Villani, *Cronica*, 8 vols., Florence, 1823, bk. XII, chap. 39, in vol. VII, pp. 103–4. Since no mention of these 750 crusaders is to be found either in Clement VI's correspondence or in the Venetian Misti, Villani's statement is more than suspect.

¹⁵⁹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1574, cols. 464–65, dated 17 March, 1345.

¹⁶⁰ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1596, 1603–9, 1638, cols. 477 ff.

to which Clement had appointed them. Although the pope had notified various princes and magnates, including the commanders overseas, of their appointments, he acceded (albeit somewhat reluctantly) to Philip's decision,¹⁶¹ and designated Francesco Michiel, archbishop of Crete, as papal vicelegate,¹⁶² and John of Biandrate, prior of the Hospitallers in Lombardy, as captain-general of the papal galleys.¹⁶³ Clement's dedication to the crusade is clear beyond dispute, but his devotion to France was greater. At this very time he was trying hard to arrange a marriage alliance between Castile and France to offset the increasing influence of England in the Spanish peninsula.¹⁶⁴

Whatever the pope's preoccupations with ecclesiastical or political affairs, the harassed crusaders were constantly in his mind. He thanked Hélión de Villeneuve for sending war machines and matériel to help keep the lower fortress at Smyrna in Christian hands.¹⁶⁵ He assured the anxious lady of Beaujeu that her husband, the lord Edward, had survived

the deadly Turkish attack, and congratulated Edward on the heroic service he had rendered and was still rendering Christendom at Smyrna.¹⁶⁶ On 16 April (1345) he pressed the French episcopacy to send in immediately to the Apostolic Camera the year's crusading tithes, which by this time should have been collected.¹⁶⁷ In writing to Philip VI on 11 May he pointed out that the Turks had begun to burn and plunder the lands of Philip's own nephew, Robert of Taranto, prince of Achaea, seizing captives, selling them like cattle, and forcing them to abjure the Catholic faith. Had not the armada sent to Smyrna stopped their advance, who could say that the Turks might not be venturing as far west as Naples and even beyond.¹⁶⁸

We have already glanced at Clement VI's letter of 15 January, 1345, to the young Humbert II, dauphin of Viennois, in which Clement informed him of Ludwig of Bavaria's apparent desire to seek a reconciliation with the Holy See. Clement asked Humbert to postpone the journey he was then planning to the Bavarian court until Ludwig's sincerity should have become clearer, and (abruptly changing the subject) told him in some detail of the Patriarch Henry d'Asti's divinely assisted victory at Smyrna against *Marbassanus, dux principalis Turchorum*. The papal letter closed with a rhetorical (but perhaps casual) appeal to Humbert that "the ardor which we know you bring to such matters may be the more strongly kindled [by this news] to aid, support, and pursue so pious an undertaking as this."¹⁶⁹ Two days later, very likely before the bearer of the letter could leave Avignon for Humbert's court at Grenoble, the disaster of S. Anthony's day occurred. The three chief leaders of the Smyrniote crusade were dead. By mid-March, as we have seen, the news was known in Avignon, and rather unexpectedly Humbert answered the pope's appeal for aid against the Turks.

¹⁶¹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1704, cols. 530–32, a letter dated at Villeneuve-lès-Avignon on 11 May, 1345, to Philip VI from the pope, who understood "quod tibi eosdem episcopum [Raymundum] et militem [Bertrandum] ad partes . . . remotas accedere non placebat . . . , nec nobis placet nec placuit quod aliqui de . . . regno, hiis temporibus quibus de commotionibus guerrarum timetur, illuc iverint sive vadant. . . ." On Bertrand des Baux, formerly Angevin bailie of Achaea, see Gay, *op. cit.*, pp. 59–60; this Bertrand should not be confused with a better-known namesake, the father of Humbert's wife, Marie des Baux (see below, Chapter 10, note 38).

¹⁶² Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1668, 1673, 1676, cols. 514 ff., dated 1 May, 1345. Michiel was a Venetian.

¹⁶³ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1675, col. 516, also dated 1 May, and *cf.* no. 1669, col. 514. John of Biandrate was then in the East, apparently conducting the defense of Smyrna.

¹⁶⁴ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1696–99, 1711–12, cols. 523 ff., and *cf.* E. Déprez, J. Glénisson, and G. Mollat, *Clément VI (1342–1352): Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, vol. II, fasc. 3 (1958), nos. 1890–93, p. 37. Although Clement authorized a "loan" of 300,000 gold florins to Philip VI (*ibid.*, vol. II, fasc. 3, no. 2549, p. 173, dated 3 June, 1346, and *cf.* no. 2679, p. 203), it must be acknowledged that there were numerous disagreements between Avignon and Paris, which are summarized in Guillaume Mollat, "Le Saint-Siège et la France sous le pontificat de Clément VI," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, LV (1960), 5–24.

¹⁶⁵ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1669, col. 514, dated 1 May, 1345, and *cf.* no. 1670. Garin de Châteauneuf, prior of the Hospital in Navarre, had leased four Genoese galleys *pro negotio transmarino* (*ibid.*, nos. 1684, 1692), which had created difficulties which the pope intervened to solve.

¹⁶⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1637, 1707, cols. 498, 533–34, dated 10 April and 11 May, 1345.

¹⁶⁷ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1647, cols. 502–3, and *cf.* no. 1719.

¹⁶⁸ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1704, cols. 531–32.

¹⁶⁹ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1397, cols. 364–66, and Claude Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II à Venise et en Orient (1345–1347)," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XXVII (1907), 511, 543–45.

10. CLEMENT VI, HUMBERT OF VIENNOIS, AND THE END OF THE SMYRNIOTE CRUSADE (1345–1352)

YOUNG and adventurous, moody and erratic, the dauphin of Viennois asked to be made captain-general of the crusade. He sent an emissary, Guillaume de Royn, to Avignon to request that he be set over the Hospitallers and all others engaged in the Smyrniote crusade although, if the king of France went overseas on the expedition, Humbert and his forces would serve under him. He offered to maintain 300 men-at-arms and 1,000 arbalesters; he would fit out five galleys; and he wanted title to whatever lands he might be able to conquer "sauf droit d'autre personne qui fust chrétienne." He would be ready to set out on the nativity of S. John the Baptist (24 June, 1345), which would seem to leave him inadequate time for preparation. Humbert was well known in Avignon, however, and neither Clement nor the Curia had the slightest enthusiasm for the idea of his taking command of the crusade.¹

Humbert saw himself as a paladin. Leadership of an anti-Turkish expedition appealed to his religious nature. At the end of April, 1345, he went to Avignon to bring personal pressure upon the Curia. The papal kitchen accounts

show that he dined with Clement VI every day from 2 to 8 May, along with a number of cardinals, the Bavarian envoys, the count of Armagnac, and others. From 15 to 22 May there was intense activity at the Curia, and the kitchen had to provide for "magna convivium," at which various cardinals were present with envoys from Aragon and Hungary, the Hospital and Venice. Another expedition to Smyrna was obviously the chief topic of discussion. From 23 to 29 May "fuit magnum festum, quia dalphinus recepit crucem."²

Humbert had got his way, and he had much to recommend him. He was very rich, the ruler of Dauphiné, and related to the royal family of Hungary. On 26 May, Clement named him captain-general of the *exercitus Christianorum contra Turchos*; he was to set out before 2 August; the crusading commanders overseas were notified of his appointment;³ and the Venetians were requested to assist him with transport.⁴ From 5 to 12 June, Humbert was still dining with the pope and cardinals; the duke of Bourbon shared their repasts; beginning on 12 June "fuerunt convivium per totam septimanam." Humbert celebrated the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (29 June) in Avignon. He was still at the Curia through the week beginning on Monday, 4 July, through which period the papal kitchen was also feeding envoys from Venice.⁵

Humbert was free to embark on the crusade as he might not have been a year before. He was the last of his line, but in 1344 he had finally provided for the succession to Dauphiné. After much discussion he had ceded the eventual title to his rich domains (in the southeast of present-day France) to Philip VI's son and successor John [II], then duke of Normandy, in the likely event that he should die without heirs. At the same time he had

¹ J. de Valbonnays, *Histoire de Dauphiné et des princes qui ont porté le nom de dauphins, particulièrement de ceux de la troisième race, descendus des barons de la Tour-du-Pin, sous le dernier desquels a été fait le transport de leurs états à la couronne de France*, 2 vols., Geneva, 1721–22 [according to the title page vol. II was published in 1721], II, doc. CCVIII, p. 507, and see the *Fragmenta quaedam desumpta ex antiquo codice iam diu desiderato, cui titulus inscribatur Memorabilia Humberti Pilati*, *ibid.*, p. 623a, on Guillaume de Royn's mission to Avignon "ut sibi [dalphino] daretur capitaneatus generalis passagii pro eundo in Turquiam et, licet domino nostro papae et dominis cardinalibus displiceret ultra modum, obtinuit. . . ." Cf. Jules Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient (1342–1352)*, Paris, 1904, pp. 62–63, and Claude Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II à Venise et en Orient (1345–1347)," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XXVII (1907), 511–12.

Humbert Pilat, fragments of whose *Memorabilia* are given at the end of Valbonnays's second volume, was a notary and secretary of the dauphins of Viennois. As the Dauphin Humbert prepared to set out for the East, he appointed his friend Henri de Villars, archbishop of Lyon, *de quo summe confidimus*, his lieutenant and vicar-general in Dauphiné (Valbonnays, II, docs. CCVI–VII, CCXVI, pp. 506–7, 513–14), and at the same time "ordinamus esse et remanere cum dicto domino archiepiscopo locum-tenente magistrum Humbertum Pilati secretarium. . ." (*ibid.*, II, doc. CCXXIII, p. 520b). Pilat died on 12 January, 1373.

² K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI.*, Paderborn, 1914, p. 284.

³ E. Déprez, J. Glénisson, and G. Mollat, *Clément VI (1342–1352): Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, vol. II, fasc. 3 (Paris, 1958), nos. 1747–50, p. 4 (cited hereafter as Déprez, II, fasc. 3).

⁴ R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemorati*, II (Venice, 1878), bk. IV, no. 161, p. 146; Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II," pp. 516, 547.

⁵ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 284.

scrupulously provided for the escheat of certain rights to the Angevin crown of Naples, and had sold the important castle of Visan to Clement VI, who had confirmed the general cession to the royal house of France on 3 August (1344).⁶ After Humbert the title of dauphin was borne by the eldest son of the French king for five centuries.

In the time of Benedict XII, Humbert had agreed to sell various feudal and allodial lands and castles to the Holy See for 150,000 florins, of which ten per cent was paid on 3 December, 1338,⁷ and on the following Laetare Sunday (4 March, 1339) Benedict gave him the golden rose.⁸ Humbert appears in the records from time to time as a guest of the pope at Avignon.⁹ Clement VI awarded him the golden rose again in March, 1343.¹⁰ When Humbert assumed command of the crusade, Clement had a jeweled scepter made for him,¹¹ and when he took the cross as captain-general on 26 May (1345), the feast of Corpus Domini, he received from the pope's own hands a silk banner emblazoned with the arms of the Church. He had it borne beside his own through the streets of Avignon to the house which he had built near the Franciscan convent.¹² These were

probably the happiest days of Humbert's life, full of "magna convivia," and full of plans and promises for the future.

On 23 May, three days before he had received the crusading banner, Humbert had leased four galleys from three skippers of Marseille. Three of the galleys were to be new and the fourth in good condition. Each would carry 200 men and be properly armed and outfitted. The skippers would serve for four months (and longer if required); the cost of each armed galley would be 650 florins a month. Humbert paid two months in advance, and the galleys were to be ready to sail the last week in July. The contract was witnessed in the Franciscan convent.¹³ Humbert was to keep with him at least 100 knights and squires for as long as the Church, Cyprus, the Hospital, and Venice were in league against the Turks, which would mean at least three years overseas.¹⁴

Humbert imposed an annual levy of almost 50,000 florins upon the castellanies of Dauphiné to meet his expenses. Every knight with three horses would be paid 12 florins a month, every squire with two horses seven florins, and Humbert was willing to enroll 200 in his service.¹⁵ The pope granted him various coveted spiritual privileges, some of them quite unusual, and was almost as generous to the dauphine Marie des Baux, who was going to accompany her husband on the expedition. He wanted benefices and other concessions for his chaplains, clerks, physicians, and retainers; on 1 August, 1345, the day before the scheduled departure of his galleys, thirty-four such petitions were presented to the pope, who granted them all. Humbert did not wish the great event of his life to be lacking in proper splendor. He is said to have had plate and jewelry melted down to make crosses, escutcheons, and images to adorn the poop and prow of his galley.¹⁶ But if his preliminary arrangements tended toward display, his preparations seem to have been reasonably thorough, and the pope did everything he could to help him on his way.

⁶ Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1013, cols. 119–24; also fasc. 1, nos. 546, 789, and fasc. 2, nos. 1034, 1101, 1121, 1171, 1177, 1187–89; Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 260–61. Humbert also sold lands to Clement's brother Guillaume Roger, viscount of Beaufort (Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 1871–76, pp. 34–35). On Humbert's lands and their disposition, see C. U. J. Chevalier, *Choix de documents historiques inédits sur le Dauphiné*, Lyon, 1874, nos. XVII–XXIII, XXXIII, pp. 67–89, 107 ff., and on the castle of Visan, note B. Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon*, Paris, 1962, p. 137.

⁷ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 84–85, and cf. pp. 89, 261.

⁸ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 135.

⁹ Cf. Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 92, 199.

¹⁰ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 222.

¹¹ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 314.

¹² Valbonnays, *Histoire de Dauphiné*, II (1721), doc. CCXXI, pp. 517–18, on the house which Humbert built in Avignon; note Humbert Pilat's *Memorabilia*, *ibid.*, p. 623b, and Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II," p. 513. The Bolognese *Cronaca Varignana* (Cod. 432 in the Bibl. Universitaria, Bologna) states that Clement VI sang the mass publicly in Avignon on the Feast of Pentecost [15 May, 1345], and confirmed the dauphin of Viennois as "duse e capitano" of all the Christians who wanted to go overseas and rewin the Holy Land from the "infidel Turks": "El quale papa diede al dicto Dalffino iii bandiere: in l'una era la figura de Christo crucifisso, in l'altra era la croce rossa nel campo bianco, in l'altra era l'arma del dicto papa" (Albano Sorbelli, ed., *Corpus chronicorum bononiensium*, in the new Muratori, *RSS*, XVIII, pt. 1, vol. II [1910–38], pp. 536–37). Although the western chroniclers provide picturesque detail, they also abound in inaccuracy.

¹³ Valbonnays, II, doc. CCX, p. 510, and cf. J. de Pétigny, "Notice historique et biographique sur Jacques Brunier, chancelier d'Humbert II, dauphin de Viennois," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, I (1839–40), 274–75.

¹⁴ Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II," pp. 512–14, and cf. Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 1747–48, p. 4 (cited above), and the full text of no. 1747 in Valbonnays, II, doc. CCXI, p. 511.

¹⁵ Valbonnays, II, docs. CCIX, CCXIV, pp. 508–9, 512, and Faure, p. 514.

¹⁶ Humbert Pilat's *Memorabilia* in Valbonnays, II, 623a, and Faure, pp. 514–16.

On 18 July (1345) Clement directed the vicelegate Francesco Michiel, archbishop of Crete, and the overseas commanders to receive Humbert with all due respect. Letters were sent on his behalf to the governments of Genoa, Pisa, Ancona, Perugia, Siena, and Florence, as well as to the Visconti in Milan, the Scaligeri in Verona, and the Pepoli in Bologna.¹⁷ Since it was planned that Humbert should cross Italy by land from Genoa, the hope was that he might pick up more recruits in northern Italy. Crusades never started on time, and as the scheduled date of departure approached, Humbert explained that he required another month to get ready. On 23 July Clement extended the date until 2 September, assuming that Humbert would thus reach the agreed-on rendezvous at Negroponte by mid-November, a month later than had been planned.¹⁸ There was talk at the Curia of arming ten more galleys against the Turks.¹⁹ The Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Carmelites were charged with preaching the crusade; those who responded in person or by contributions commensurate with their means would receive the same indulgence as those *transfretantes in Terre Sancte subsidium*.²⁰

About two weeks before he sailed Humbert received 5,000 florins, and his wife Marie 1,000, from the tithes collected for the crusade.²¹ From Marseille on 2 September (1345) Humbert sent the castellan of Oulx a quittance for 130 florins to buy clothes and jewels for a young lady about to be married.²² On the following day he set sail in the galley *Sancta Crux* for Genoa, where he arrived on 14

September with five galleys and a small ship, to be welcomed by the archbishop, Jacopo da S. Vittoria, and the clergy, and Giovanni Murta, the new doge, as well as the podestà, the city council, and many citizens. Upon his arrival in Genoa, Humbert went to worship in the church of S. Lorenzo, accompanied by his mother, his wife, some ladies, and a number of French nobles. He slept that night in the Dominican convent, and left the city the next day. The Genoese chronicler Giorgio Stella believed they were all going to Jerusalem, "to the Holy Sepulcher."²³

Although through May and June, 1345, the Venetian Senate more than once discussed the necessity of sending immediate help to the beleaguered crusaders at Smyrna, the Venetians wanted as little disruption as possible of their trade in the Archipelago. They also saw the opportunity of resuming their old ties with Alexandria, and brought pressure upon Clement VI to allow them to do so. But they were now beginning to have trouble with King Louis of Hungary over Zara, which was preparing for its "seventh" rebellion against S. Mark.²⁴ Humbert of Viennois had informed Giustiniano Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador at the Curia Romana, that he planned to go eastward via Venice; the ambassador had of course promptly notified the Senate, which replied on 5 July that conditions in the East required Humbert to speed his passage. He would waste

¹⁷ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 1837–38, p. 20, and cf. no. 1861, p. 32, and E. Déprez and G. Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres closes, patentes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1960), nos. 714–15, p. 89, also dated 18 July, 1345.

¹⁸ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, no. 1846, pp. 27–28, and Faure, pp. 549–50.

¹⁹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 1847, p. 28, dated 26 July, 1345. Various concessions were granted to Robert of S. Severino, count of Corigliano, who proposed to lead the ten galleys (Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1, nos. 725–29, 734–35, 739–41, pp. 90–92). Nothing came of these plans. Robert got caught up in the defense of the Neapolitan kingdom against the troops of King Louis of Hungary.

²⁰ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, nos. 1855–56, pp. 29–31.

²¹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 1906, p. 39.

²² J. Roman, "Charte de départ du dauphin Humbert II," *Archives de l'Orient latin*, I (1881, repr. 1964), 537–38, publishes the text with a rather inaccurate foreword.

²³ Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1345, in *RISS*, XVII (Milan, 1730), cols. 1085E–1086A.

²⁴ Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 23, fols. 3 ff., 12, 14^r, 18^r, 19^r–20^r, 23^r–24^r ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920, repr. 1964), 196–99, on the seventh revolt of Zara (in 1345–1346). On 27 April, 1344, Clement VI had granted the Venetians a license to send six galleys and four other ships to Alexandria and other lands subject to the sultan of Egypt once every five years provided they did not trade in slaves and military contraband (G. M. Thomas, ed., *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, I [Venice, 1880, repr. New York, 1965], no. 144, p. 277; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. iv, no. 122, p. 137). However, in a letter of 5 July, 1345, to Giustiniano Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador in Avignon, the Senate requested some modification of the "gratia nobis facta per dominum papam de quattuor navibus et sex galeis" (Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 22^r, and see the *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. iv, no. 172, p. 149; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 162, pp. 306–7). On provision being made in the Senate for the Aegean trade, cf. F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I (Paris, 1958), no. 178, p. 57, dated 3–4 June, 1345, and nos. 179, 183, and on western relations with Egypt, where conditions were very unsettled, see Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, pp. 82–86.

time in coming to the lagoon; besides, there were no ships in Venice to put at his disposal.²⁵

But Humbert sent one Nicholas d'Astribort as an ambassador to Venice to request *galeae de gardia* from Brindisi to Glarentza and to inquire about the cost of transporting horses from Brindisi to Smyrna. At the time d'Astribort set out, Humbert still expected to be in the area of Brindisi by the end of September. The Senate replied on 2 August, agreeing to use galleys of the Gulf to convey him and his "harness" as far as Glarentza. As for the horses, it would cost nine or ten ducats apiece to transport them from Brindisi to Smyrna. They would require ships (*naves*), because the galleys of the Gulf were too light and too low.²⁶ Although the Senate wished to forestall Humbert's coming to Venice, with the inevitable demands upon Venetian transport (which was allegedly not available in the city), there is no evidence that the Republic was unwilling to assume her fair share of the costs and risks of continuing the offensive against the Turks. The growing pressure from Hungary, a projected expedition against Zara, and the desire to advance the Republic's commercial interests in Alexandria were doubtless serious distractions; moreover, a recent report from Giustinian may have made the Senate wonder whether Clement and the Curia were not themselves beginning to moderate their enthusiasm for further large investments in the crusade.

Giustinian had written the Senate of an audience he had had with Clement about the beginning of July, 1345. They spoke at length of their respective commitments to the crusade.

²⁵ Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 22^r (the letter alluded to in the preceding note), and Faure, p. 517. Cf. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 168, p. 148.

²⁶ Faure, pp. 517–18, 550–52, with texts from the *Commemoriali*, Reg. 4, fol. 87^r (cf. Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 159, p. 300; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 183, p. 151), and Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 30^r, and note the proposed instructions of 26 September to the captain of the Gulf (in the Misti, *ibid.*, fols. 35^r–36^r) ". . . quod ob reverenciam Dei et honorem nostri domini complaceretur domino dalfino Viennensi, capitaneo generali ecclesie sancte Dei contra Turcos, videlicet quod galee nostre Culfi vel illa pars que dominio videretur esse[nt] apud Brundisium circa finem mensis Septembris pro associando eum et gentes suas, etc., sicut in dicta parte plenius continetur," but the orders which Faure, p. 519, describes as having been given to the captain of the Gulf were never actually sent since the annotation "non scribatur" appears twice in the left margin, where the cross (which signifies that a senatorial resolution was put into effect) is also lacking.

The Venetians had promised to provide a fourth part of the armada, which of course they had done, but Clement pointed out that after all the crusade was very much a Venetian concern (as Giustinian wrote home, *negocium principaliter tangebatur nos*) because of their large holdings in the Levant. Clement wanted the Senate also to provide a contingent of horse for the coming expedition, and stated that "it was never his intention to make himself the chief of these operations [*caput in predictis*] but only to be a helpful partner, and that he had decided to exchange two of his galleys and two of the Hospitallers' for horsemen, and given the fact that this reduction was being made in his and the other galleys, it was his opinion that no alteration or exchange should be made in our galleys, but since they were more effective than the others in the said service, they should remain continuously in the aforesaid enterprise." On 25 July a resolution of the Senate commended Giustinian's dexterous and evasive handling of the pope's proposal that Venice furnish cavalry in addition to galleys, and instructed him to say "that God knows, and nothing is hidden from Him, and his Holiness can fully understand, that the commitment [*oblatio*] we made in this sacred undertaking was appropriate and of large scope: in making it we had regard solely for the honor of God's name and of holy Mother Church—for a bulwark and defense, protection and preservation of the souls of the faithful in the East [*de illis partibus*] who were being drawn to perdition with every passing day."

The Senate had not been deterred by the heavy weight of this commitment, and did not intend to be now. The Venetians were firmly resolved to stand by the promises they had made. "But we thoroughly believe that the number of galleys as it is at present is sufficient for the present, and also effective and essential, and should not in any way be diminished." Certainly soldiers were necessary to attack the Turks on land; galleys running here and there did the same thing in the Aegean. If the pope wanted to substitute horsemen for the four galleys in question, Giustinian was to tell him that whatever he wished was agreeable to Venice, but if he reverted to the proposal that Venice supply a *subsidiu[m] equitum*, Giustinian was to extricate himself *honestis verbis*, present the Republic as always prepared to stand by her

promises as she had done in the past, press for the requested modifications of the Alexandrian trading concessions, and seek confirmation of the anti-Turkish league in its current form. When Giustinian had done all this *cum nostro honore*, he was to return to Venice.²⁷

The suggestion that the pope substitute horsemen for galleys originated in Humbert's suite. Knights felt more comfortable in the saddle than on deck. There was, however, a continued exchange of amenities between Venice and Humbert, who by an order dated at Avignon on 21 July (1345) directed all his subjects to render the Venetian ambassador Giustinian or any other agent of the Republic whatever services might be requested of them.²⁸ On 8 August the Senate passed a resolution granting to an envoy of the dauphin a license to travel eastward with a small suite in the Alexandrian galleys "since he says that he has permission from the lord pope,"²⁹ and on 12 September the dauphin received the privilege of Venetian citizenship with full enjoyment of all the rights of a member of the Venetian nobility.³⁰ The Senate, however, did not want Humbert to come to Venice.³¹ They may have feared that he would repeat the papal request for cavalry to serve at Smyrna; he would presumably request additional transport; and very likely they did not want members of his suite to learn the extent of the Republic's preparations against Zara.

Nevertheless, Humbert made his way to Venice. He left Genoa on 15 September, and probably landed at Porto Pisano, whence he proceeded up the Arno valley to Florence. Giovanni Villani says that Humbert passed through Florence "with his company of men-at-arms in the pay of the Church . . . at the beginning of the month of October, 1345."³² At some point he learned of the still mysterious murder (at Aversa on the night of 18–19 September) of Andrew of Hungary, the first husband of Queen Joanna I of Naples. He was so shocked by the news that he appears to have thought of abandoning the crusade, in view of the likely political repercussions in Italy, for Louis the Great would not allow his brother's

murder to go unpunished. Humbert had close ties with both Hungary and Naples. On 7 October Clement VI wrote him, urging him to continue in his divinely appointed task, and requested Hugh of Geneva, his close friend and companion in arms, also to give him some (doubtless needed) words of encouragement.³³

With the eyes of all Europe upon him, Humbert did continue. According to the Bolognese *Cronaca Varignana*, he entered Florence with 400 horsemen and fifty women. On Monday, 10 October, he arrived at Bologna, where he was received with honor by Taddeo de' Pepoli, lord of the city, who provided quarters for him at the Dominican church, and paid his expenses during the several days he spent in Bologna. Humbert knighted two of Taddeo's sons, Giacomo and Giovanni, who in their turn knighted twenty-one or twenty-two other young Bolognese on 16 October. The ceremonies were followed by a great feast, after which Humbert left for Ferrara, accompanied by Giovanni de' Pepoli. Now Obizzo d'Este, lord of Ferrara, received him with "grandissimo honore," gave him three handsome horses

²⁷ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2027–28, pp. 61–62. Hugh of Geneva was the most conspicuous member of Humbert's suite (*Chevalier, Docs. sur le Dauphiné* [1874], no. XXIX, pp. 99–100, and *Misti, Reg.* 23, fol. 47^r). Popular rumor made Joanna a party to her husband's murder, and everyone expected King Louis of Hungary to seek vengeance. The best account of the murder, the shock it caused in Avignon, the accusations which Louis made against Joanna, her sister Maria, and the princes of Durazzo and Taranto, as well as the Hungarian invasion of Naples [events occurring from September, 1345, to the end of July, 1348] may be found in Émile G. Léonard, *Histoire de Jeanne I^{re}, reine de Naples, comtesse de Provence (1343–1382)* [the first two volumes comprise *La Jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}*], 3 vols., Monaco and Paris, 1932–37, I, 465–712, and II, 1–143. From Aversa on 22 September, 1345, Joanna sent the Florentine government a brief but detailed description of Andrew's murder, "infandum scelus, scelesti nephas, piaculari flagitium Deo abominabile mundoque orrendum" (for the text, see Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta externa*, II [Budapest, 1875], no. 90, pp. 97–98, and cf. nos. 92, 93 [letter of Clement VI to Louis the Great of Hungary, dated 29 September, 1345, showing how fast the news reached Avignon], 96, 118 ff., 124, 132, 137, 141, 162, 173, and 218 ff.).

On 14 March, 1346, Clement VI declined to concede the kingdom of "Sicily" (Naples) to the insistent Louis of Hungary and his brother Stephen (Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2363, p. 125, and cf. no. 2478 *bis*, p. 148). The situation seemed especially perilous since Edward III of England and Ludwig of Bavaria had declared themselves ready to support Louis. Joanna fled from Naples (to take refuge in her county of Provence) on 15 January, 1348, and Louis entered the city on the twenty-third (Léonard, *op. cit.*, II, 26–45).

²⁸ *Misti, Reg.* 23, fol. 28^r.

²⁹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 168, p. 148.

³⁰ *Misti, Reg.* 23, fol. 31^r.

³¹ *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 173, p. 149; Valbonnays, II, doc. CCXXV, p. 526.

³² Faure, pp. 519–20.

³³ Giov. Villani, *Cronica*, 8 vols., Florence, 1823, bk. XII, chap. 39, in vol. VII, p. 104.

in scarlet caparisons, "and to his wife he gave a chessboard, all of silver gilt, and on the next day the said dauphin went on to Venice."³⁴

Humbert of Viennois arrived in Venice on 24 October, stating that he wished to arrange for "his speedy transit to Romania;" on the following day the Senate provided for the election of five *sapientes* to confer with him on the crusade. Giustinian had returned from Avignon, and is listed first among the five chosen.³⁵ On the twenty-sixth the *sapientes* reported back to the Senate that Humbert was most anxious to start his voyage eastward before the onset of winter. The Senate now agreed to arm "with all expedition" two galleys to accompany the dauphin and his forces to Glarentza. Thereafter these two galleys would return to assist the Venetian army at Zara; in the meantime the captain of the Gulf would send two galleys to remain with the army until the return of the galleys which were to escort Humbert to the Morea. Humbert wanted a firm price set for the transport of 400 horses overseas, to which the Senate replied that horses could go in unarmed vessels belonging to private shippers. The state could not set prices for the use of vessels belonging to individuals, but the Senate would help him find suitable transport for the horses at a reasonable price.³⁶ The Senate hoped for the full success

of the Christian league "as well as for the suppression of the Agarene wickedness," and for the preservation of the faith, the increase of the faithful, and the security of Venetian subjects in the Levant. His excellency and all the world could see the zeal and ardor which Venice brought to the Christian cause. She had always believed that the crusade would succeed. Now her citizens hoped that Christ would aid the dauphin in the provident command of his army. Venice was prepared, if the pope so wished, to extend the anti-Turkish league (*unio*) for another two or three years. Apparently reverting to the problem of transporting horses and equipment, the Senate also stated that some of the Venetian and allied galleys might be opened at the stern if this procedure seemed necessary. They would send along with him a captain and four other nobles, with whom Humbert might take counsel with full confidence (and who could watch over the state galleys). The crusading army should not lack food. The dauphin would do well to find provisions in the Regno and the "duchy," in the area of Foggia, and in the "empire of Romania." Venice produced no grain in her territories, and had to import it in large quantities, but the Senate was ready to do whatever was proper and possible, so that Humbert's army should have *victualia*, and they would so inform the captain whom they were sending with Humbert.³⁷

In Venice the Dauphin Humbert almost immediately displayed the indecision which was to mark his performance in the Levant. Now that the Senate had armed and placed at his disposal two galleys, he sent Archbishop Philip of Mytilene into the chamber to ask whether it would not be better for him to go eastward by way of Hungary. He may have thought he could add some Hungarians to his forces, and presumably he wanted to know at first hand something of King Louis's plans to avenge Andrew's death. Both Humbert's interests and those of his wife Marie, daughter of Bertrand des Baux, count of Montescaglioso in the Basilicata, would be most seriously affected by a

³⁴ *Corpus chronicorum bononiensium*, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XVIII, pt. 1, vol. II (1910-38), pp. 537-38. The Bolognese *Cronaca Rampona* (Cod. 431 in the Bibl. Universitaria, Bologna) says that Humbert arrived in Bologna on 10 October, was lodged at the episcopal palace (*et desposò in vescoado*), and on 16 October knighted the young Pepoli at the altar of S. Niccolò in the Dominican church. It also states that "li predicti misser Iacomo et misser Zohanne si feno cavalieri xxi da Bologna" (*RISS*, XVIII, pt. 1, vol. II, pp. 531, 533, Cron. A). The facts in the *Rampona* correspond to those given in the *Cron. Villola* (*ibid.*, pp. 533, 535-36). The *Cron. Bolognetti* also places the knighting of the young Bolognese on 16 October (*ibid.*, p. 536). The *Chronicon Estense*, ad ann. 1345, in *RISS*, XV (1729), col. 424D, states that the young Pepoli knighted twenty-two companions "die Mercurii XV mensis Octobris de nocte," but 15 October fell on a Saturday in 1345. When Humbert reached Venice there were apparently 305 persons in his suite, including knights, religious, squires, ladies, and servants of various kinds, all described as *comedentes aut librati in hospicio dalphinali in Venetiis*, and listed in Chevalier, *Docs. sur le Dauphiné*, no. XXVIII, pp. 96-99, and cf. Faure, pp. 524-26.

³⁵ Faure, pp. 523, 553, with text of the Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 39^r.

³⁶ Agents of the dauphin had been buying horses in Treviso (Chevalier, *Docs. sur le Dauphiné*, no. XXVII, pp. 95-96).

³⁷ Faure, pp. 523-24, 554-56, with text of the Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 40^r. In line with the Senate's suggestion, the pope extended the duration of the league and the anti-Turkish tithes for two years on 12 December, 1345 (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 182, p. 151, and Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2203-6, pp. 91-92).

Hungarian invasion of the Neapolitan kingdom.³⁸ On 3 November (1345) the Senate reminded the archbishop of Mytilene that Humbert had asked them to help speed his passage to the Levant; going by way of Hungary would entail excessive *tarditas et impedimentum*; "nevertheless he is a sage prince, and can act and arrange his affairs as seems best to him."³⁹

Humbert sailed on or about 12 November, when the Senate wrote Marino Grimani, captain of the Gulf, to send to the army at Zara two heavily armed galleys which should remain "until the return of the other two galleys which are bearing the lord dauphin on his way."⁴⁰ Clement VI had followed Humbert's rather slow progress, and on 15 November he reluctantly acceded to the further "prorogation" of Humbert's arrival at Negroponte until Christmas.⁴¹

Some time during this period a wondrous account of a Christian victory over the Turks spread through parts of Italy and France. Men believed in miracles, and tall tales were told in taverns and hostelryes, ports and villages. A Latin letter vaguely dated 1345, purportedly written by Hugh IV of Cyprus to Joanna I of Sicily (Naples), recounts the details of an extraordinary battle which took place on 24 June when "we were gathered in a plain between Smyrna and Altoluogo, and the Turks had 1,200,000 warriors, and we only 200,000." Once begun, the battle lasted until evening. The outnumbered Christians became so exhausted they could fight no longer, "and prostrate we expected to receive the palm of martyrdom." As the bloodthirsty Turks advanced against them, the Christians raised their voices to heaven in prayer, beseeching Christ to grant them strength of faith and heart "that in thy name we may be able to obtain the boon of

martyrdom, because we cannot resist them." But as the Christians despaired of victory, awaiting death with tears and lamentations, a mysterious figure suddenly appeared amongst them. He rode a white horse, and carried a white banner with a red cross. Clad in camel's hair, he had a long, thin face and a flowing beard. "O fideles, nolite timere . . .," he called to them: "Surgite . . . et viriliter ad pugnam mecum venite! . . ." The Christians responded as though they had not been fighting at all. They rushed at the Turks; the oncoming darkness was stayed; "and thus by divine aid we obtained victory in the battle." The Christians celebrated a mass of thanksgiving, and the celestial apparition told them, "You have gained what you sought, and you will win greater victories than this if you remain steadfast in faith." When they asked him who he was, he replied, "I am he who said, 'Ecce agnus Dei . . .'" Then he disappeared as the sweetest odor suffused the atmosphere. The Christians suddenly found themselves incredibly refreshed without either food or drink; melodious voices filled the heavens; and at length they set about burying all the dead they could find, of whom 70,000 were Turks. According to a contemporary French version of this letter, 73,000 Turks were killed in this marvelous battle, and 3,052 Christians.⁴² The mysterious figure who had converted defeat into victory was of course S. John the Baptist. The Latin text is well written, concise, dramatic, edifying; possibly intended for preachers

³⁸ On Bertrand des Baux, who is to be distinguished from the vicar-general of Achaea of the same name, see Léonard, *La Jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}*, I, 30-32, 337-38, 566-67, 582 ff., et alibi. In 1309 Bertrand had married Beatrice (d. 1321), one of the daughters of King Charles II of Naples; Beatrice was the mother of Marie des Baux, who had married Humbert in October, 1332.

³⁹ Faure, pp. 526, 557, with text of the Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 40^r, dated 3 November.

⁴⁰ Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 40^r, dated 12 November: ". . . que due galee stent ad dictum exercitum [contra Jadram] usque ad reditum aliarum duarum galearum que portant dominum delfinum."

⁴¹ Faure, pp. 526, 557-58; Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2149, p. 82.

⁴² N. Iorga, "Une Lettre apocryphe sur la bataille de Smyrne (1346)," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, III (1895, repr. 1964), 27-31, and Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle, Paris, 1896, pp. 51-56, who believes that there is a basis of fact in the spurious letter, which P. Lemerle doubts (*L'Émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident: Recherches sur "La Geste d'Umur Pacha,"* Paris, 1957, p. 196, note 1). If any such engagement took place "between Smyrna and Altoluogo," it was unimportant enough to escape our more reliable sources. Altoluogo is Ephesus, the city being named from the Church of S. John ('Αγιος Ἰωάννης or 'Αγιος Θεολόγος, whence such an Italian form as Aitoloco and the Turkish Ayasoluk), on which note I. Melikoff-Sayar, *Le Destân d'Umür Pacha*, Paris, 1954, p. 39, note 2, and Leontius Machaeras, *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle,'* ed. and trans. R. M. Dawkins, 2 vols., Oxford, 1932, II, 113-14. For the French version of the letter, see Jules Michelet, *Histoire de France*, III (1837), 190-92, on which note J. de Pétigny, "Notice . . . sur Jacques Brunier . . .," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, I (1839-40), 276-78, who believes that the battle took place although the numbers of combatants and casualties given in the letter are "d'une exagération ridicule."

of the crusade, it seems clearly to be propaganda to aid in the recruitment of volunteers for service overseas. After all, S. John had promised (quite truly, as the account makes clear) that few would die in the battle, and those who did would obtain life eternal; he also promised that still greater victories lay ahead if only Christian warriors remained steadfast in their faith.⁴³

The credulous chronicler of Pistoia had also read the letter—or heard a preacher read it—and he improved upon the story, increasing the number of Turkish dead to 700,000, adding that “after this very many Christians from all Italy were moved to go and fight for the faith against the Turks.”⁴⁴ And well they might, but the Christians had the further assurance of “molti miracoli . . . in quello tempo,” one of which especially impressed the chronicler. In the city of L’Aquila or just outside there was a little church, and one day the Virgin herself appeared upon the altar, holding the Child and carrying a cross. Everyone flocked to the church. She remained above the altar until the third hour, more resplendent and more beautiful than the sun. “And know that all the children who were born that day in L’Aquila had the imprint of a little cross upon the right shoulder. Hence, because of this miracle, many Aquilani and others of the countryside took the cross and went to fight against the infidels.”⁴⁵

Humbert of Viennois finally reached the crusading rendezvous at Negroponte about Christmas, 1345. He was well received by the Venetian colony, which presented him with a gift of 200 gold ducats. Months later the Senate decided that the sum should be covered by an assessment which the bailie should impose upon the burgesses and others in the community.⁴⁶ There was no neglect of eastern affairs in

Venice during the weeks and months that followed Humbert’s departure from the city. The Senate passed resolutions to arm three galleys, appoint commanders, and recruit men for service overseas. They concerned themselves with the Alexandrian trade, and even tried (quite unsuccessfully) to reconcile the spirited marchioness of Boudonitza, Guglielma Pallavicini, with her Venetian husband Niccolò I Giorgio, in which connection they appealed to Humbert for assistance (on 24 January, 1346).⁴⁷ The pope wrote him “that Saracens, Tatars, and other infidels, enemies of the cross and the name Christian, in a large and hostile gathering at Caffa, . . . have laid siege to the city by land on all sides,” and requested him to aid the Genoese galleys defending Caffa if he could do so without jeopardizing the crusade, by which the pope presumably meant the extension of the Smyrniote beachhead.⁴⁸

Clement did not reduce the number of papal galleys to be employed against the Turks, because (as we shall see) Humbert had decided that he preferred galleys to horsemen after all. Presumably the Venetians changed his mind. On 21 January, 1346, Clement gave a detailed financial quittance to officials of the Hospital for 25,600 florins which the Apostolic Camera had provided for the maintenance of his four galleys.⁴⁹ Although Clement had looked with disfavor upon his Genoese captain, the late Martino Zaccaria, he had put the latter’s son Centurione in command of a galley. Centurione figures prominently in the cameral accounts. On 17 June (1346) the Camera paid him and one Raymond Marquesan of Nice each 3,200 florins for expenses for four months, “in which they are to serve the pope and the

colectam et getum communiter imponendum inter communitatem, burgenses et alios de Nigroponte . . . , et hoc scribatur domino baiulo Nigropontis quod predictam faciat inviolabiliter observari.”

⁴³ Iorga, *ROL*, III, 29, 30: “. . . pauci qui morientur ex vobis vitam eternam obtinebunt . . . , et maiora hiis impenetrabit si in fide perstiteritis.”

⁴⁴ *Storie pistoresi*, 130, ed. S. A. Barbi, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XI, pt. 5 (1907–27), pp. 215–16, where the number of Christian dead is given as 3,053 rather than 3,052!

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, *RISS*, XI-5, p. 214. There is an absurdly exaggerated account of the popular response to the crusade in the *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, I, 13, in L. A. Muratori, *Antiquitates italicae*, III (1740, repr. 1965), col. 369.

⁴⁶ Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 53^r, dated 6 July, 1346: “. . . Consulunt concorditer sapientes quod dicti ducati auri ductum de quibus communitas Nigropontis fecit exonium [i.e. donum] dicto domino delphyno debeant exigi et solvi per

⁴⁷ Misti, Reg. 23, fols. 41^r, 42^r, 43^r, 44^r, 46, 50^r; Thiriet, *Régestes*, I (1958), nos. 181, 188, 193, pp. 57 ff. On the Marchioness Guglielma’s contest with her husband Niccolò Giorgio, see Wm. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, pp. 251–53, 258–61, with texts from the Misti, Regg. 16, 23–24. The appeal to Humbert to intercede with the marchioness is noted in the Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 46^r, and cf. Miller, “A Lady of Thermopylae,” *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, XXI (1936), 399–403.

⁴⁸ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2216, p. 94, dated at Avignon on 18 December, 1345.

⁴⁹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2281, pp. 104–5. Apparently 50,000 ducats had been deposited to Humbert’s account in Venice (*ibid.*, nos. 2282–85, and esp. nos. 2286 and 2548).

Roman Church with two galleys as ordered by the pope against the Turks in the region of Smyrna," making the obvious total of 6,400 florins. (Nevertheless, as we shall see presently, Clement intended to keep four galleys in the Aegean.) Centurione was then pressing the Camera for the further sum of 1,200 florins which he claimed was still due his father in unpaid salary,

and because the . . . pope had often sent large sums of money to the master of the Hospital . . . to pay the stipends and salary of the said galleys and captain, he did not know whether or not the . . . lord Martino had been paid. And while it was also stated that the . . . galleys had not been armed according to the agreements made with the pope, as is clear from public documents, the pope, wishing nevertheless to deal graciously with the said Centurione, had had the sum deposited (until clarification could be had concerning this matter) with Giacomino da Sarsana . . . and Luchino Peregrini, merchants of Genoa, on 2 May, 1346, [and] today [on 19 June] by order of the pope the said sum has been assigned in payment to the same Centurione,

who thus received another 1,200 florins.⁵⁰

On 19 August (1346) Clement VI wrote Dieudonné de Gozon, who had recently succeeded Hélión de Villeneuve as master of the Hospital, that he was sending Centurione Zaccaria and Raymond Marquesan of Nice into the Aegean with two galleys to take the place of the two least seaworthy of the "four old galleys" (which he had sent on the Smyrniote expedition). The papal squadron would still consist of four galleys. Zaccaria and Marquesan were each to receive 800 florins a month as *stipendia* for their galleys, and inasmuch as Clement was providing for a full year's service, each was to receive a further 6,400 florins, making a total of 12,800 for their two galleys for eight more months. Since payment was made for the other two galleys, "which will be retained," at the same rate, they would cost 19,200 florins, amounting in all (as Clement states) to 32,000 florins. Payments would begin when the galleys left port. The Curia had learned, however, from trustworthy sources that the "four old galleys" had not been kept in continuous service, because they had put into port and remained

there from time to time (apparently too often in the pope's opinion), and had therefore not rendered the *servitium debitum* called for by the contracts which the skippers (*patroni*) had made with the Holy See. Since one could not reckon in advance the future periods of actual service, the Curia was arranging to send to the Hospital at Rhodes 16,000 gold florins (the prior of Navarre was acting as papal paymaster), and Clement wanted certain persons delegated to keep an eye on the galleys and send *secreta informatio* to the Camera, so that payment could be made to correspond with service. Clement also stated that he was sending copies of the contracts recently made with Centurione and Raymond as well as those made with the *patroni* of the "four old galleys," so that Dieudonné and the officials of the Hospital might be fully informed concerning all relevant detail.⁵¹

Zaccaria and Marquesan had already been paid 6,400 florins. The papal squadron would cost 38,400 florins for a full year's service, but according to the *exitus* accounts on 30 June (1346) the Camera had paid out to the prior of Navarre, Garin de Châteauneuf, and two of his confrères the sum of 10,400 florins, and on 9 September it made available to Garin the further sum of 48,000 florins on assignment to Dieudonné in Rhodes for disbursement to the *patroni* of the four papal galleys.⁵² If these financial gyrations are hard to follow, they are summed up in a letter of quittance which Clement issued on 17 September (1346) to the papal treasurer, the Benedictine Étienne Cambarou, then bishop of S. Pons de Thomières in southern France: payments to Marquesan and Centurione Zaccaria, 6,400; arrears of Martino Zaccaria's salary, paid to Centurione, 1,200; to Garin de Châteauneuf and two Hospitallers, 10,400; again to Garin, 48,000; to Bishop Antonio de'Aribandi of Gaeta and Giovanni Scarlatto, bishop-elect of Coron, for missionary work in Armenia, 1,000;

⁵¹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2752, pp. 227–28, and cf. no. 2742. Similar letters were sent to Humbert and Archbishop Francesco Michiel of Crete, the papal vicelegate.

⁵² Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 322. The pope had trouble getting Marquesan and Zaccaria to live up to the terms of their contract and to provide two galleys fit for service in the Levant (Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2835–38, pp. 250–51, dated 24 September, 1346, and see below, p. 208a). Garin de Châteauneuf was later accused, unjustly according to Clement VI (Déprez, *ibid.*, no. 2889, p. 259), of trying to prevent by bribery the election of Dieudonné de Gozon as master of the Hospital.

⁵⁰ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 321–22. As will be clear to anyone accustomed to reading papal documents, Schäfer substitutes the word *papa* almost everywhere in his transcriptions for *dominus noster*, which in the cameral accounts as elsewhere is the common form of reference to the pontiff.

and to two Armenian envoys who had come to the Curia, 300—making a grand total of 67,300 florins expended on eastern affairs in the three months from 17 June to 17 September.⁵³ Whatever dictum be rendered on the reign of Clement VI it is clear that he gave much attention to eastern affairs, and spent large sums on the anti-Turkish offensive. He had already instructed Archbishop Henri de Villars of Lyon and Bishop Jean de Chissey of Grenoble that they could receive from all and singly in Dauphiné, clerics and laymen, goods fraudulently acquired (*bona male ablata*) and absolve from the charge of peculation (*ab reatu*) those who would restore such goods, which were to be applied to Humbert's crusade against the Turks.⁵⁴

As Humbert continued his preparations at Negroponte, the war between France and England burst into fury. Clement VI wrote him on 7 February, 1346, congratulating him that as a crusader in the Levant he was winning an eternal reward as well as the praise of Christendom, and not shedding Christian blood "as you would have had to do and would now have to do if you were on this side of the water." Clement stated that he was extending the crusading subsidy from three years to five, and was attending as best he could to certain matters of importance to Humbert in France.⁵⁵ On the fifteenth Clement dispatched letters to the governments of Genoa, Pisa, Ancona, Perugia, Siena, and Florence, as well as to Alberto and Mastino della Scala of Verona, Giovanni and Luchino Visconti of Milan, Taddeo de' Pepoli of Bologna, and others, asking them to send assistance to Humbert in his overseas enterprise.⁵⁶ A few days later (on the nineteenth) the Venetian Senate granted the dauphin's friend Hugh of Geneva permission

to transport not more than fifty men "with light harness [*levibus arnesiis*] . . . in our galleys of the league;" two of the dauphin's chaplains were to go with them; and so was "a certain official of the lord duke of Athens with . . . one servant and light harness," who would be let off somewhere in Greece, as the captain thought best.⁵⁷ The duke of Athens was of course Gautier de Brienne, who was probably sending an emissary to his retainers in Argos and Nauplia.

While the French and English were much distracted by the beginning of the Hundred Years' War, the Italians were anxious for news of Humbert's crusade. When facts were not forthcoming, the chronicler of Pistoia apparently adapted rumor to his purpose, relating that, upon leaving Venice, Humbert had proceeded to Mytilene, "eighteen miles from Turkey." He mustered his forces on the island, 2,300 foot and 70 horse, and remained there for fifteen days, whereupon 1,500 Turks descended upon him in 26 ships. They offered combat, which the dauphin accepted. The Turks disembarked, the dauphin defeated them and burned their ships, "and the field remained to the dauphin and to his Christians." The Turkish leader (*lo barone Mitaometto*) was captured, and offered his weight in silver as a ransom. Humbert is said to have refused the ransom, and insisted upon the conversion to Christianity of both the leader and the other captives, who declined to save their lives by the sacrifice of their faith. Humbert then had "Mitaometto" and 150 other Turks shot by bowmen. The chronicler adds that 100 men from the region of Pistoia had fought in the battle of Mytilene under the command of one Federico Cancellieri, who flew the checkered banner of the commune, and that in the eighteen months preceding 10 February, 1346 (presumably the date of the battle of Mytilene), the Christians had taken over six towns in Turkey, including of course Smyrna.⁵⁸ It is

⁵³ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2809, pp. 244–45. The text is also given in Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 323, note, where it is misdated 17 October. On the Armenian missionaries, whom the pope commended to the Dauphin Humbert, note Déprez, *ibid.*, nos. 2777–79, p. 239, dated 3 September, 1346, and Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1960), nos. 1177–97, 1199–1201, pp. 149–52.

⁵⁴ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2333–34, p. 120, dated 26 February, 1346. Henri de Villars was Humbert's lieutenant in Dauphiné during his absence on the crusade (Chevalier, *Docs. sur le Dauphiné* [1874], p. 115, note 1).

⁵⁵ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2305, pp. 109–10.

⁵⁶ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1960), no. 911, p. 116.

⁵⁷ Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 47; C. Faure, "Le Dauphin Humbert II . . .," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XXVII (1907), 528. Humbert received other recruits from the West (Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, no. 2329, p. 118).

⁵⁸ *Storie pistoresi*, 135, in the new Muratori, *RiSS*, XI-5, pp. 219–20. Faure, p. 529, sees no reason to doubt the veracity of the chronicler, but would put the battle of Mytilene at the end of March, 1346. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin* (1957), pp. 195–96, rightly rejects the account as "bizarre."

hard to believe anything in this account. Such a victory would never have escaped mention in Clement VI's correspondence, nor would the hundred Pistolesi serving in Humbert's army.

Humbert sent a number of messengers to Avignon,⁵⁰ for he frequently needed advice as well as money. Among them was one Bartolommeo de' Tomari, described as a "canon of Smyrna," who probably left Negroponte in early March, 1346, since he gave the pope a letter or letters and oral messages from Humbert on 30 April. Humbert wrote that the clergy and people of Negroponte had received him "exultantly and honorably," and that six galleys of the league had met him at Negroponte, the four papal galleys, a Hospitaller galley, and one belonging to the Venetians. In a long letter of 15 June, Clement answered one by one the points raised by Humbert. The skippers of the four papal galleys had complained that the Camera had not sent their subsidies, to which Clement replied that the Curia had been informed that the galleys had withdrawn from service (*de illis partibus recessisse*) as early as the preceding August, and he had no desire to pay for inactivity. Furthermore, while Humbert was still in Avignon, he had wanted the pope to reduce the four galleys to two, and to add to the expedition a hundred armed horsemen (with the money which would thus be saved). But presently Philip, the archbishop of Mytilene, had appeared at the Curia to explain that Humbert had decided four galleys would be more useful than two and the proposed hundred horsemen. The pope, therefore, wishing to follow Humbert's advice, had ordered four galleys to be outfitted at Genoa, to be sent to the East, and for these payment had largely been made. But now by Humbert's own letter and from conversation with Bartolommeo the pope had learned that Humbert wished to retain the four galleys already in the Levant which had seen so little service. Clement was thus not unreasonably perplexed as to what he should do with the four galleys that he was having prepared at Genoa, but he had decided to send two of them eastward, and they would bring the funds to pay both past and future debts. They would replace the two least satisfactory of the "four old galleys." The Camera had been obliged to wait for the new galleys, for there was no other way to send the money safely. (By this time the

transport of money and even letters had become a serious problem in Avignon: the failure of the Florentine banking houses between 1343 and 1346 had brought an end to the transference of funds by bills of exchange).⁵¹ Next month the galleys would set sail from Genoa with two Hospitaller galleys, and so payment to the complaining skippers and crews would soon be made for service actually rendered to the Christian cause in the Aegean.⁵¹

At Humbert's request the pope agreed to write Anna of Savoy, the dowager empress and regent in Constantinople (1341-1347), to request that the island of Chios, "so essential to you and the league," be turned over to the Latins as a base of operations for three years. The Greeks were to retain all their rights and revenues, and suitable guarantees were to be given to the Byzantine government that Chios would be returned when the expedition was over. Humbert was to use any opportunity that presented itself to help pave the way for the reunion of the empress and the Greeks with the Catholic Church, but Bartolommeo would explain upon his return why Humbert was not to deal with the empress's enemy John Cantacuzenus. (Within two weeks or so Clement would learn that Cantacuzenus had had himself crowned co-emperor at Adrianople on 21 May, 1346.) At Humbert's request Clement

⁵⁰ The Camera Apostolica and the Chancery had frequently used the agents and couriers of the Florentine banking houses for the transmission of both letters and money, but after the well-known bankruptcies of the early 1340's the distant delivery of letters, funds, and financial instruments became very difficult, on which see Yves Renouard, "Comment les papes d'Avignon expédiaient leur courrier," *Revue historique*, CLXXX (1937), 1-29, esp. pp. 19 ff., and cf. Renouard, *Les Relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378*, Paris, 1941, pp. 113-14, 249, 384-92.

We have already seen Philip, archbishop of Mytilene, active in Venice on Humbert's behalf. On 11 December, 1345, Henri de Villars, lord lieutenant of Dauphiné, authorized that Philip be reimbursed for the expenses he had incurred in undertaking the mission to Venice as well as that to Avignon, to which Clement VI here alludes (Valbonnays, II [1721], doc. CCXXVIII, p. 528).

⁵¹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2580, pp. 180-81, dated 15 June, 1346, and cf. no. 2651, p. 198. Clement's letter to Humbert of 15 June is also given in A. Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatori de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947, doc. CLXXXVIII, pp. 242-46. The prior of the Hospital in Capua, Isnard de Albarno, received over-all charge of the two papal galleys until they should reach Humbert's headquarters (Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2741, 2745-51, pp. 225-27, dated 18-19 August, which shows that by this time the two galleys had not yet set sail!). Isnard was also entrusted with a secret mission for the pope.

⁵⁰ Cf. Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2478, p. 148.

also suspended for three years, "although it did not seem expedient to some persons," the sentences of excommunication and the interdict under which the Catalan Grand Company had labored since they had seized Thebes and Athens from the Brienne. Humbert had asked for permission to coin money for the use of the league, which Clement granted with certain reservations. For the rest, Clement wrote that he was trying to make peace in Lombardy, and that he would send frequent letters and couriers to Humbert, as the latter had stated he wished him to do.⁶²

The pope had a duplicate of his letter prepared for transmission to Humbert "because of the perils of the journey." On the same day (15 June, 1346) letters were written to Anna of Savoy, who is called "Joanna," and to Francesco Michiel, the vicelegate, concerning the proposed temporary cession of Chios to the crusaders. The archbishops of Patras and Thebes were told they might lift for three years the bans of excommunication and the interdict levied against the Catalan Company in Greece provided the Catalans maintained a hundred horse and a hundred foot to serve during this period with Humbert's forces. The pope wrote Hugh IV of Cyprus, asking him to maintain his galleys against the Turks since the Holy See was doing so, and the Hospitallers and the Venetians would "undoubtedly" do so, in which connection he also wrote the master of the Hospital and the doge of Venice. Letters were drafted to Marie des Baux, the dauphine, and to Niccolò Pisani, captain of the Venetian galleys. A two years' truce was proclaimed in northern Italy in the hope of removing at least one serious distraction from the crusade.⁶³

⁶² Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2580, pp. 181–83, and cf. nos. 2729–33, 2737, dated 17 August, 1346. Clement VI had already tried to establish some measure of *pax et concordia* between Gautier de Brienne, titular duke of Athens, and the Catalan Grand Company before Humbert had set out on the crusade, for which see Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, doc. CLXXXIII, pp. 236–37, which should be dated 1 April, 1345, as in Déprez, I, fasc. 2, no. 1608, cols. 482–84. Francesco Giunta, in his brief article "Sulla Politica orientale di Clemente VI," in *Studi di storia medievale e moderna in onore di Ettore Rota*, eds. P. Vacari and P. F. Palumbo, Rome, 1958, pp. 156–57, has failed to note that Rubió misdated this document, and that Raymond Saquet did not succeed Henry d'Asti as papal legate in the East, because Philip VI would not allow Saquet to leave France.

⁶³ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2581–86, 2588–95, pp. 183–85, dated 15 June, 1346. On 5 July the interdict was lifted for five months from the Catalan kingdom of Sicily

Bartolommeo de' Tomari was preparing to go back to the dauphin and the vicelegate. He received a letter of commendation,⁶⁴ and on 22 June clerks of the Camera gave him 150 florins for the expenses of the return journey.⁶⁵

In the meantime there had been an unexpected development in the East. On 8 June (1346) the Genoese admiral Simone Vignoso had suddenly appeared off Negroponte with twenty-nine galleys. His fleet had originally been formed for an attack upon a large colony of exiled Genoese nobles at Monaco, who had themselves been preparing galleys and mustering land forces to try to effect their forcible re-entry into Genoa. But upon the dissipation of this danger by the flight of the exiles to Marseille the new government of the Doge Giovanni Murta decided to use the fleet on a venture to the Levant, to protect the eastern possessions of the commune and to try to break the Tatar siege of Caffa. At Negroponte, Vignoso found (we are told) twenty-six armed galleys and 400 horse of the anti-Turkish league under Humbert, who (Vignoso was told) was planning an attack upon Chios. As we have observed, the Zaccaria had possessed Chios for twenty-five years (the Greeks had recovered it in 1329), and Vignoso wanted to re-establish Genoese supremacy on the island, for which he had more reasons than patriotic pride. Before he had sailed from home at the beginning of May, the Genoese government had undertaken to reimburse the owners of the galleys for their losses and expenses; until this obligation was met, they were to receive the revenues accruing from any conquests they might make. Humbert quickly learned that the Genoese were aware of, and opposed to, his designs upon Chios; he is said to have promised Vignoso 10,000 gold florins a year, and to have offered the *patroni* of the Genoese galleys another 30,000 in gems, pearls, and money if they would join the crusaders in an assault upon Chios. They refused, and some of Vignoso's men attacked Humbert's fleet, seizing horses, jewels, harness,

(*Trinacria*), but this had little or nothing to do with the pope's attitude toward the Catalans in Athens (*ibid.*, nos. 2627–30, pp. 192–93). On Catalan Athens, see below, Chapter 17.

⁶⁴ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2587, where Bartolommeo is described as "vicarius Francisci archiepiscopi Cretensis;" a safe-conduct was prepared for him on 15 June, 1346 (Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1, no. 1023, p. 131).

⁶⁵ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 321.

and other things, which they employed in their occupation of Chios, where they landed on 15 June. Within a week they had taken the entire island except for the castle overlooking the town, which yielded to a three months' siege on 12 September. Four days later Vignoso moved on to the Anatolian coast, and had occupied both Old and New Phocaea by the twentieth of the month. Vignoso's partners claimed to have expended more than 250,000 *librae* in the enterprise. It was all a startling success, and appeared to have restored the Genoese commercial establishment in the Levant.⁶⁶

Humbert seems to have sailed to Smyrna in late June, shortly after his unfriendly encounter with Vignoso. The author of the sprightly, imaginative, and unreliable *Historia romana* says that a great concourse of crusaders gathered at Smyrna, and every day the Venetians brought more of them in their ships: "How much money those ships made! How they fleeced the crusaders!" They exacted the last farthing as the faithful came together from Coron, Modon, Phocaea, Patras, and Monemvasia. While the Venetians at Smyrna awaited

Humbert's arrival, they are alleged to have sent an embassy to Umur Pasha at "Altoluogo" (Ephesus) to seek a truce and to demand the whole city of Smyrna (*domannavano le Esmirre interamente*). The Venetian envoys are said to have found Umur Pasha sitting on the ground, leaning on his left arm, in a thoughtful mood. He was elegantly clad in silk, enormously fat, his stomach like a wine cask; heavily sweetened food was being served to him on brightly painted earthenware platters. He drank almond milk, wielded a golden spoon on eggs, spices, and rice, "and ate abundantly" (*e fortemente devorava*). Having listened to what the Venetians had to say, Umur Pasha stated that he was perfectly aware the dauphin was on his way to attack him, but that he entertained no fear on that account as long as his two Christian friends were thriving. "Who are these friends of yours?" he was asked, and replied through an interpreter who spoke Latin, "They are Guelf and Ghibelline!"

By this time the dauphin had arrived at Smyrna, according to the *Historia romana*, with no more than thirty knights. He closed the gates, established order among the people (in the lower city), and allowed no one to go out. He made sorties from the walls, and captured many Turks. Large numbers of crusaders joined him from Rome, Germany, France, and Picardy, so that 15,000 Christians were to be found there at one time. But after these sorties adversity set in; the heat was fearful, and men walked in dust almost to their knees. The crusaders became ill, and died like sheep. There was famine. The master of the Hospital would not allow Venetian ships to enter the harbor, according to the *Historia romana*, and supplied the Turks with food and arms. Men suffered severely; some took to the ships; others went off on their own. The Venetians appropriated the crusaders' funds. The dauphin built high walls with towers, gates, and ditches; the Venetians placed guards over them, and took charge of the lower town. Having thus fortified the small Christian community in the harbor fortress, the dauphin saw nothing more that he could do. He left Smyrna, and returned to his own land, "and such was the end of the crusade of Smyrna."⁶⁷

How the master of the Hospital could prevent the Venetians from entering the harbor

⁶⁶ The text of the first pact, dated 26 February, 1347, between the Genoese government and the *Mahona* (or joint-stock company) formed by Vignoso and his partners to exploit Chios and the Phocaeas is given in Carlo Pagano, *Delle Imprese e del dominio dei Genovesi nella Grecia*, Genoa, 1852, pp. 271-85, and in the *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, II (Turin, 1857), *Chartae*, no. CXCI, cols. 558-72 (in the *Historiae patriae monumenta*, IX). An historical preamble to the text states that the castle of Chios was surrendered "with certain pacts and conventions which [the admiral Vignoso, the *patroni* of the galleys, and their partners in the *mahona*] made with the Greek inhabitants, as appears in the public instrument written in the hand of the notary Pellegrino de' Bracelli on 12 September, 1346," and after the seizure of Old and New Phocaea and the return of the fleet to Genoa, Vignoso and the *patroni* claimed their total expenses "ascendere ad maiorem quantitatem librarum CCL millium" (*ibid.*, col. 560CD), which figure was, however, disputed in Genoa. Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1346, in *RISS*, XVII (1730), cols. 1088-89, says that the castle at Chios surrendered on 3 September, and cf. Cantacuzenus, III, 95 (Bonn, II, 583), and Gregoras, XV, 6, 1-2 (Bonn, II, 765-66). See Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Amsterdam, 1967), 491-93; Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (1904), pp. 71-73; Faure, pp. 530-31; and esp. Philip P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the Island (1346-1566)*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1958, I, 86-124, for a full account. A sketch of Chian history, until the Genuese domination was brought to an end by the Turks in April, 1566, may also be found in Geo Pistarino, "Chio dei Genovesi," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., X (Spoleto, 1969), 3-68.

⁶⁷ *Historiae romanae fragmenta*, I, 13, in Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ*, III (1740, repr. 1965), cols. 369, 371.

when they controlled the lower fortress, is not clear. That Humbert made sorties from the walls seems likely. News of a clash with the Turks, in which he scored a victory but lost five of his knights, is said to have reached Grenoble in September, 1346.⁶⁸ At this time the two galleys which the Holy See had leased under the command of Raymond Marquesan of Nice and Centurione Zaccaria of Genoa had not yet made the eastward passage. Indeed, on 24 September the pope directed Isnard de Albarno, prior of the Hospital at Capua, and the bishops of Padua and Monte Cassino to compel Marquesan and Zaccaria to furnish two *fortes et magnae galeae* instead of the two *debiles et parvae* which they had proposed to take to the Levant "contrary to the terms of the contract made with the Camera Apostolica." Marquesan, moreover, had decided not to go to the Levant, but to remain in Naples at the request of his aged and ailing father, and one Antoine Ruphi of Nice was to take his place. Humbert and Francesco Michiel were informed of these developments,⁶⁹ but they had probably left Smyrna before the pope's letters had left Avignon.

The commanders of the papal galleys had been demanding their subsidies, which had been unpaid for some time, pending the arrival of funds from Avignon. Humbert had given them his own money "lest [as Clement VI put it] on the pretext of our failure to pay they should give up their service." Humbert had apparently shared the illness of his forces at Smyrna. Indolent and irresolute by nature, he withdrew from the Anatolian mainland in the late summer (the precise date is unknown), and went to the Hospitaller stronghold of Rhodes, where he spent the winter of 1346–1347. He had sad tales to tell the pope, and sent off a letter (or letters) with Bartolommeo de' Tomari, who was accompanied this time on the long journey to the Curia by two knights, Lancelme Aynard and Jean de Gex (*de Gay*). The three

envoys arrived at Avignon toward the end of October or the beginning of November. Aynard and de Gex soon departed for the French court, presumably to try to collect from Philip VI certain feudal rents which had been outstanding when, some time before, Humbert had sold the crown a half-dozen small fiefs.⁷⁰ Jean de Marigny, the bishop of Beauvais, also owed Humbert money, which Clement VI directed him to pay when on 11 November, 1346, he had letters of commendation prepared for Aynard and de Gex, who were going to pay the bishop a visit after they had been to Paris.⁷¹

Clement answered Humbert's letter on 28 November, congratulating him on his recovery from an *infirmetas*. He said that "already a good while ago" (*iam diu est*) he had sent Garin de Châteauneuf with money enough for about a year's support of the papal galleys, covering both past indebtedness and future commitments. Humbert would be fully reimbursed for the amount he had paid the complaining skippers. It did not seem advisable just then to send a *legatus de latere* to the East, as Humbert had clearly wanted. Furthermore, Clement and the Sacred College had granted Robert of S. Severino, count of Corigliano, who had promised to lead ten galleys on the crusade, a postponement because of the turbulence in the kingdom of Naples. Indeed, as Humbert must know, most of the world was now caught up in the storms of war, as satanic winds increased the tempest.⁷² Humbert had wanted more crusaders sent eastward, but it was no wonder they could not be recruited even if they wanted to serve. Clement stated, however, that he had directed the Venetians not to impede the passage of such crusaders as could be found, and he had written Philip VI and the bishop of Beauvais concerning the debts which Humbert claimed they both owed him. Aynard and de Gex (*tui milites*) were taking his letters on their

⁶⁸ Humbert Pilat's *Memorabilia*, in Valbonnays, II, 624a: "... illo tempore mense Septembri venerunt nova de domino nostro dalphino quod ipse et gentes suae bellaverant contra Turcos et devicerant eos, multos interfecerant, quinque bonis hominibus de gentibus domini dalphini dumtaxat interfectis in bello [of whom three are named in Pilat's text]. . . ." Cf. Gay, pp. 73–74, and Faure, pp. 532–33.

⁶⁹ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2835–38, pp. 250–51. On the bishops of Monte Cassino and Padua, note C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 169, 385.

⁷⁰ Cf. the letter of Henri de Villars, archbishop of Lyon and Humbert's lieutenant in Dauphiné, in Chevalier, *Docs. sur le Dauphiné* (1874), no. XXXIII, pp. 107–8, dated 19 September, 1346.

⁷¹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2933–34, p. 266. Humbert had sold his lands in Normandy to Jean de Marigny, who still owed 12,000 *livres* on them (Valbonnays, II, docs. CLIV–V, pp. 426–28).

⁷² Henri de Villars also dwells on the "guerra dura" in his letter to Humbert of 19 September, 1346 (Chevalier, *Docs. sur le Dauphiné*, no. XXXIII, p. 112). On Robert of S. Severino, see Léonard, *La jeunesse de Jeanne I^{re}*, I (1932), 435 and esp. note 2, 450–51.

northward journey. As for certain *alia secreta*, which Humbert had touched upon in his letter, Clement stated that he was replying to them in another letter,⁷³ for the subjects certainly required handling with secrecy as well as with discretion.

The "other letter" bears the same date (28 November, 1346): France, England, Germany, and Italy were torn by warfare and dissension, Clement began, which prevented those who wanted to join Humbert from fulfilling their vows as crusaders. Tithes and other subsidies could no longer be collected. Humbert had raised in his letter the question of a truce with the Turks, to which Clement replied with alacrity that "having given careful consideration to these and other events, it seems to us not only expedient but even entirely necessary . . . to proceed to make the truce, which you have mentioned in your letter to us, in the best, most honorable, and safest way possible." The cardinals were in unanimous agreement. Humbert was to consult with the vicelegate, the master of the Hospital, the prior of Capua, and the *patroni* of the Cypriote, Venetian, and other galleys. Although he had some suggestions, the pope left the manner of effecting the truce to Humbert's discretion, but insisted that the negotiations should be carried on in secrecy, and nothing divulged even to Humbert's envoys. The truce should not be made for more than ten years, by which time one could hope that Europe would be at peace. In the meantime Clement could send no more money "while the present evil [of war] persists." Humbert was anxious to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, but he should not go until the truce had been made and confirmed; then he could go to the Holy Land and return to France with the pope's blessing, notwithstanding the vows he had made to remain in the East for three years.⁷⁴

A letter to Humbert usually gave rise to several others relating to the crusade. Clement wrote Dieudonné de Gozon, directing him to proceed cautiously toward a truce with the Turks and informing him of the need to reimburse Humbert for his payments to the *patroni* of the papal galleys. He informed Isnard de Albarno of his letters to Humbert

and Dieudonné, and requested Garin de Châteauneuf to write him of the withdrawal to Rhodes, the expenditure of the money he had carried eastward, and the state of affairs in the Levant. He thanked Marie des Baux for sending him news of her husband's recovery, and urged Hugh of Geneva to stand by Humbert in defense of the Catholic faith against the Turks.⁷⁵ Bartolommeo de' Tomari, the ever-useful "canon of Smyrna," was to take the letters back to Rhodes; on 4 December he received a safe-conduct (*securus conductus*);⁷⁶ two days later clerks of the Camera gave him 150 florins for his expenses on the return journey.⁷⁷

Although the person (or persons) with whom Clement authorized Humbert to make a truce is not mentioned in the "secret" letter of 28 November, it was obviously a question of dealing with Umur Pasha, who would probably be receptive to the idea if he had other irons in the fire. Whether there was an exchange of embassies between Rhodes and Umur's court, we do not know; it is possible, but subsequent events will make clear that there certainly was no truce.⁷⁸

The crusade had failed. The Venetian Senate had been much pleased with the "comportment" of Humbert's associate Francesco Michiel, vicelegate and archbishop of Crete, but now they declined a request from Humbert (whatever it may have been), and blandly thanked his envoys for their expression of his good will.⁷⁹ Nevertheless the Senate voted on 11 March, 1347, to excuse Niccolò Pisani, formerly captain of the Venetian galleys of the anti-Turkish league, from accepting his election as provveditore in "Sclavonia" in order for him to join Humbert (at the latter's request) on the island of Rhodes.⁸⁰ Pisani could go to Humbert if they both so wished, although

⁷³ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 2958-60, 2962-63, 2974, pp. 273, 276, dated 28 and 30 November, 1346.

⁷⁴ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2982, p. 277.

⁷⁵ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 321. Bartolommeo had received the same amount the previous June, as he was preparing to return to the dauphin in the East, on his earlier mission to the Curia (Schäfer, *loc. cit.*, and see above, notes 64-65).

⁷⁶ Cf. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin* (1957), pp. 200-1, 223-24.

⁷⁷ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 23, fols. 50^r, 70^r, dated 11 April, 1346, and 7 February, 1347. Faure, pp. 535-36, believes that Humbert had probably requested financial assistance.

⁸⁰ Misti, Reg. 24, fol. 6^v.

⁷³ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2956, pp. 270-71; Faure, pp. 559-62.

⁷⁴ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 2957, pp. 271-72; Faure, pp. 534-35.

apparently Venice intended to spend no more men or money on this crusade.

In the meantime Humbert had dictated his will on 29 January in the palace of the master of the Hospital, who witnessed it together with Michiel, Isnard de Albarno, Garin de Châteauneuf, and Pancrazio Giustinian, who had been appointed captain of the Venetian galleys of the league.⁸¹ Humbert was tired; the crusade was not to his liking; he wanted to go back home. Clement VI had said that Humbert might return with papal blessing after he had arranged a truce with the Turks and, if he wished, had made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. No truce had been made, however, and Humbert had sworn to remain three years in the East. About the time he made out his will, he wrote to Clement, who declared on 6 March that he was caught up in important matters, but would answer soon.⁸² Two weeks later (on 19 March) Clement had three letters prepared for dispatch to Rhodes: he allowed Humbert to return although the required three years had not elapsed; granted him the right to have a suitable confessor dispense him from his oath; and permitted him to designate two ships (*naves*) and twelve galleys which might carry merchandise to Alexandria provided they did not convey arms or other contraband to the Moslems.⁸³ The papal chancery also made out requests for "safe-conducts," on Humbert's behalf, to the chief authorities in the cities or areas through which he would presumably pass on his way back to the south of France.⁸⁴

Humbert's wife Marie des Baux died at Rhodes, probably about the middle of March, 1347, for the news is said to have reached Grenoble on 1 May. Time weighed heavily upon Humbert now, and anticipating Clement's favorable replies to his petitions, he embarked for Venice, where he arrived during the last week in May. He was lodged in the Dominican convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo,

where an inventory of his silver plate was prepared on 27 May, very likely with a view to its sale.⁸⁵ According to the chroniclers, it was a terrible spring; there was the worst famine that anyone could remember; and the price of grain rose to fearful heights until the new harvest. King Louis of Hungary was ready to invade Italy. It was a bad time to raise money. Despite Humbert's large initial expenditures and all the money he had taken on the crusade, it was said that he still owed 30,000 gold florins, but he apparently managed to pay off the debt during a month's residence in Venice.⁸⁶ Clement too was anxious to close his crusading accounts, and on 19 May (1347) the Camera settled with the procurators of the *patroni* of the four papal galleys by paying to each one various sums totalling some 5,000 florins, in addition to 6,346⅔ florins which were to be paid in Cyprus.⁸⁷ In the meantime the efforts of Henri de Villars, the governor of Dauphiné, combined with the pope's generosity, had put 10,000 florins in Humbert's empty pockets,⁸⁸ which helped him to meet his obligations.

On 21 June (1347), while Humbert was still in Venice, Clement wrote him a brief letter of welcome home, stating that it was not necessary to say more, because he would see him shortly in Avignon.⁸⁹ On 14 July he wrote Humbert again, declining to send him more money. He wanted to talk with him (*colloquium personale*), and if by chance, before coming to the Curia, Humbert should see King Louis of Hungary, Clement wanted him to dissuade Louis from invading the Neapolitan kingdom, which was a

⁸¹ Valbonnays, II, doc. CCXXXIX, pp. 541-48, "actum in civitate Rhodi infra castrum habitationis domini magistri . . .," and cf. Faure, p. 536.

⁸² Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 3162, p. 314, and note nos. 3163-64; Faure, p. 536.

⁸³ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, nos. 3179-81, p. 317.

⁸⁴ Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 3182, p. 318, dated 19 March, 1347, and addressed to the doge of Venice, the papal rectors of Ancona and the Romagna, Obizzo d'Este in Ferrara, Taddeo de' Pepoli in Bologna, Giovanni and Lucchino Visconti in Milan, Mastino della Scala in Verona, Jacopo da Carrara in Padua, Lodovico Gonzaga in Mantua, and Giovanni Murta in Genoa.

⁸⁵ Valbonnays, II, doc. CCXLIV, pp. 555-57, and cf. Faure, p. 537. On 15 May Clement wrote Humbert a letter of consolation on the death of Marie, "in partibus transmarinis defuncta" (Déprez, II, fasc. 3, no. 3292, p. 345; Valbonnays, II, doc. CCXLIII, p. 554).

⁸⁶ *Chronicon Estense*, ad ann. 1347, in *RISS*, XV (1729), col. 437BC, and *Corpus chronicorum bononiensium*, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XVIII, pt. 1, vol. II (1910-38), pp. 563-64, 565, 566-67.

⁸⁷ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 359. The *patroni* were Antonio Vacca, Antoniotto de' Grimaldi, the late Corrado Piccamiglio, and Centurione Zaccaria. Cf. also Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1961), no. 2101, p. 290.

⁸⁸ Déprez, Glénisson, and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 3, nos. 3221, 3274, pp. 326, 342, dated 9 April and 6 May, 1347, and cf. Faure, pp. 538-39.

⁸⁹ E. Déprez, J. Glénisson, and G. Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, vol. II, fasc. 4 (Paris, 1958), no. 3334, p. 357 (cited hereafter as Déprez, II, fasc. 4).

fief of the Holy See.⁹⁰ Having left the trials of the crusade behind him in the East, Humbert seemed in little hurry to get home. Altogether he spent about three months in northern Italy, and only reached Grenoble on 8 September, 1347. Entries in the *exitus* accounts of the Camera record his presence in Avignon from 27 October to 10 November, when he apparently dined every day with the pope,⁹¹ whose affability and courtesy assured him a gracious reception.⁹²

Whatever the excuses Humbert may have offered at the Curia for his conduct of affairs in the East, and whatever soothing responses he may have received from a French pope and French cardinals, the crusade had been a dismal failure. To Matteo Villani, Humbert was a "soft fellow, of little force and firmness," and while he gained some measure of honor and esteem as a crusader, "tornò con poca buona fama."⁹³ The Turkish chronicler Enveri has written that although the Turks had at first feared Humbert, because he was believed to be powerful, Umur Pasha had reduced him to a "scarecrow."⁹⁴ Modern historians have tended to agree with Enveri's and Matteo's appraisals of Humbert's capacity. The hostility of the Genoese had added to Humbert's burdens; the Venetians were less co-operative than they might have been, besides which they got along badly with the Hospitallers. There is little evidence, however, to support the view that the occasional slowness of Clement and the Curia to reply to Humbert's inquiries from overseas impeded military action on his part. We have seen that Clement tried to do what his "captain-general" of the crusade wanted, but Humbert's own indecisiveness was constantly baffling to the Curia.

Having lost his only son in 1335 and his wife in 1347, Humbert finally turned his back upon the secular world. In 1344, as we have noted,

he had tentatively provided for the cession of Dauphiné to Duke John of Normandy, the eldest son of Philip VI of Valois. Now on 16 July, 1349, at a gathering of high ecclesiastics and feudal magnates in the Dominican convent at Lyon, Humbert abdicated in the presence of John and the latter's eldest son Charles. He surrendered the dauphinate irrevocably to Charles, and bestowed upon him the scepter and ring, the ancient sword of the dauphinate and the banner of S. George.⁹⁵ On the following day he received the Dominican habit from the prior of the convent, and so became the *illustrissimus princeps F. Humbertus dalphinus Viennensis antiquior . . . Ordinis Praedicatorum frater*. Among other good works, he quickly set about promoting the eastern missions and providing for the study of Greek among Dominicans at Paris. On 1 February, 1350, he publicly announced to an assembly of the nobles of Dauphiné his cession of the principality and certain other lands to Charles, to whom the nobles were henceforth to take the oath of fealty.⁹⁶ At the end of the year he is said to have left Dauphiné never to return, and on Christmas day (of 1350) he received holy orders from Clement VI, apparently becoming a subdeacon at midnight, a deacon at dawn, and a priest at the following high mass. A week or more later, on 3 January, 1351, he was consecrated Latin patriarch of Alexandria, and on 30 April, 1352, he was made *administrator perpetuus* of the church and archdiocese of Rheims,⁹⁷ but he soon wished to resign because of his poor health and the allegedly heavy burdens of the office. Nevertheless, on 25 January, 1355, King John nominated him bishop of Paris, and procurators were soon on their way to Avignon to take the matter up with Clement's successor Innocent VI.⁹⁸ A few months later, Humbert found himself at Clermont in Auvergne, where he fell ill and died in the Dominican house on 22 May, 1355, at the early age of forty-three. His body was taken to Paris, where he was buried under the steps to the high altar "on the gospel side" of the Dominican church on the Rue S. Jacques, his

⁹⁰ Déprez, II, fasc. 4, no. 3371, pp. 364–65.

⁹¹ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 359; Faure, p. 539; and cf. Déprez, II, fasc. 4, no. 3580, p. 408.

⁹² On Clement's character, cf. Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* (1962), pp. 137–40. According to Valbonnays, I, 344, when Humbert returned to Avignon, "Il en fut reçu avec des démonstrations de joye et de bienveillance."

⁹³ Villani, *Cronica*, 6 vols., Florence, 1825–26, bk. 1, chap. 26, in vol. I, pp. 40–41.

⁹⁴ Irène Mélikoff-Sayar, ed. and trans., *Le Destān d'Umūr Pacha (Düstürnâme-i Enveri)*, Paris, 1954, verses 2265–68, p. 122, and cf. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 201.

⁹⁵ Cf. Valbonnays, II, docs. CCLXXIV–V, pp. 594–605, and cf. doc. CCLXXXVIII, pp. 621–22.

⁹⁶ Valbonnays, II, doc. CCLXXXIV, p. 616.

⁹⁷ For the dates, see Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 82, 419, and cf. Pilat's *Memorabilia*, in Valbonnays, II, 626b.

⁹⁸ Cf. Valbonnays, II, doc. CCLXXXVI, pp. 617–18, and vol. I, p. 352.

epitaph containing no reference to his nomination to the church of Paris.⁹⁹

Although the Venetians were obviously relieved by Humbert's withdrawal from the scene of action to Rhodes, they were not ready to drop out of the anti-Turkish league. In January, 1347, the Senate voted to arm five galleys, for service with the league, in the arsenal at Venice.¹⁰⁰ These galleys were doubt-

⁹⁹ Humbert's life is sketched in Valbonnays's remarkable *Histoire de Dauphiné*, I (1722), 299–353, to which work we have made frequent reference in this chapter. On Humbert's part in the second Smyrniote crusade, see, *ibid.*, I, 334 ff., and on his subsequent career, pp. 345 ff. See also Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I (Paris, 1719, repr. Turin, 1961), 641–44, with a good deal of reliance on Pilat's *Memorabilia*; Louis de Mas Latrie, "Les Patriarches latins d'Alexandrie," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, IV (1896, repr. 1964), 4. In papal letters of 4 and 7 August, 1349, Humbert still appears as *dolphinus Viennensis* (Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, vol. III, fasc. 5 [Paris, 1959], nos. 4218, 4220, pp. 12, 13), but by 4 September Charles is addressed as dauphin (*ibid.*, no. 4244, p. 20), and on the twelfth Humbert as *antiquior dolphinus* (no. 4246, p. 22).

According to the *Prima vita Clementis VI* [apparently written during the pontificate of Benedict XIII and certainly before 1333], in Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914–22, I, 255, Humbert ceded the dauphinate "modo subsequenti, videlicet quod, eo ipsum relinquente, sibi in eo succederet rex Francie et sui perpetuo in regno successores, hac adjecta etiam conditione, quod semper remaneret in manibus et regimine regis vel filii sui primogeniti qui erit vel sperabitur esse in regno successurus." For significant references to Humbert in other lives of Clement, see, *ibid.*, I, 265–66, 282, 306, 548–49. The *exitus* accounts of the Camera Apostolica record expenses incurred in January and February, 1351, for the king of France, the duke of Orléans, and Humbert, who were all in Avignon together "quando dolphinus fuit consecratus" (Schäfer, *Ausgaben* [1914], pp. 437, 441), and in March, 1353, Humbert appears as *dominus dolphinus olim Viennensis, nunc archiepiscopus Remensis* (*ibid.*, p. 539). An inventory of Humbert's books, jewels, reliquaries, crosses, crucifixes, and other possessions, on deposit in a room at the Dominican convent in Paris, was prepared on 18 May, 1355 (edited with a brief but poor introduction by Henri Omont, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LXXVI [1915], 467–71).

¹⁰⁰ Misti, Reg. 23, fol. 68^r, dated 15 January, 1347 (*more veneto* 1346): "In Christi nomine armentur ad viagium unionis contra Turchos de hinc tres galee . . . et statim scribatur duche et consiliariis Crete quod de inde armari faciant duas alias galeas, dando pro quolibet homine ducatos duos . . ." [from a motion that did not pass], but on fol. 68^v of the same date it was agreed "quod in Christi nomine armentur hic galee quinque ad viagium unionis contra Turchos . . . , et fiant capitaneus et supracomiti . . . , et dicti capitaneus et supracomiti stare et esse debeant per medium annum et tantum plus quantum videbitur huic consilio. . . ." Six months was the usual period of service. Contrary to Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, p. 202, no galleys were to be armed at Crete; he was misled by Thiriet, *Régestes*, I (1958), no. 194, p. 60, which he cites from the proofs.

less meant to be replacements for those in use at the time. In the spring of 1347, probably as Humbert was sailing from Rhodes to Venice, the Christian allies suddenly improved their hitherto dreary performance by defeating the Turks in an engagement of some importance. In letters of 24 June (1347) to Francesco Michiel and Dieudonné de Gozon, the pope expressed pleasure in receipt of the news that galleys of the league, with divine assistance, had captured 118 Turkish vessels (*vasa navigabilia*) at the island of Imbros. At the approach of the Christians, the Turks had sought refuge on land, but their opponents had surrounded them, and sent for reinforcements of horses, arms, and men (which Dieudonné provided from Rhodes).¹⁰¹ If there were 118 *vasa*, most of them must have been small fishing boats commandeered by some Turkish emir or captain, and in any event there is no reason to believe that the Turks in question came from Aydin (Smyrna), and that Umur Pasha had suffered a setback. But it is possible that the Christian success helped turn the eyes of Umur's good friend John Cantacuzenus westward.

When Cantacuzenus re-entered Constantinople as emperor on 3 February, 1347, he found in the city one Bartholomew of Rome, whom the Dauphin Humbert had sent as an envoy to the dowager empress Anna Palaeologina, the former Jeanne of Savoy. Bartholomew was a canon of Negroponte, where he had served as vicar of the Latin Patriarch Henry d'Asti. Whether or not Cantacuzenus prevailed upon him to do so, Bartholomew promptly wrote both Clement VI and Humbert the most glowing accounts of the new emperor's occupation of the Byzantine capital. Cantacuzenus modestly incorporated these two letters in his memoirs.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Déprez, II, fasc. 4, nos. 3336–37, pp. 357–58; Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (1904), pp. 78–79; Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 202, 224.

¹⁰² Cantacuzenus, *Hist.*, IV, 2 (Bonn, III, 12–20). If the letters are genuine, it is a little difficult to believe that they were sent to Clement and Humbert in the form in which Cantacuzenus reproduces them. See R. J. Loenertz, "Ambassadeurs grecs auprès du pape Clément VI (1348)," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XIX (1953), 178–79, 189–90. Bartholomew of Rome and Bartolommeo de' Tomari are two quite different persons, a fact which Gay, pp. 95 ff., unfortunately failed to observe. John VI ruled as emperor in Constantinople from 3 February, 1347, until his abdication on 10 December, 1354; for the details and dates, see Donald M. Nicol, "The Abdication of John VI Cantacuzenus," *Byzantinische Forschungen*, II (1967), 269–83.

Cantacuzenus had known Bartholomew years before at Demotica in Thrace when on diverse occasions they had engaged in theological disputations at the request of the Emperor Andronicus III, who died in June, 1341. Cantacuzenus was grand domestic at the time, and he is said to have shown himself well disposed toward ecclesiastical union in these apparently formal discussions. Subsequently he had received Bartolommeo de' Tomari at Selymbria, and they had talked amicably together, presumably on the same subject. Now, "immediately upon his entrance into Constantinople," Cantacuzenus had summoned Bartholomew of Rome, and explored with him the means of reconciling the Greeks to the Latin Church and of securing their obeisance to Rome. He prepared with the consent of his young co-emperor, John V Palaeologus, a golden bull which they both signed in cinnabar ink, "giving our lord the pope his proper title and recognizing the primacy and universality of the Roman Church." Cantacuzenus's desire to unite Christendom under the triple tiara knew no bounds, "and he will observe that obedience which the pope has received from the king of France, and thus he intends, for himself and his empire, to enter into union with the lord pope and the Roman Church, even as the king of France." He needed help, however, against his enemies, "Christian, Saracen, and pagan," and proposed a synod to discuss union, which might best be held in Constantinople, although Negroponte or Rhodes might also be considered. But in holding such a synod Cantacuzenus would need the strong support of a Latin armada, "so that by force and fear he may be able to induce the obstinate to [accept] the Roman faith," to which many Greeks were already inclined. Furthermore, Cantacuzenus was prepared "to join his banner with the banner of the pope and [that of] the lord dauphin . . . , nay even to proceed in person against the Turks. . . ." He would go with a Christian armada against Smyrna (*armata Smirnarum*)! In fact he would take command of the expedition if the pope so wished, and he had no doubt that he could achieve more "with the armada in one month

against the Turks than has been done in one year by the captains of the present armada." Finally, he wanted the pope to assist him against Stephen Dushan, the king of Serbia, who contrary to all right had occupied Greek territory. Cantacuzenus reviewed all these points with Bartholomew of Rome between 1 September and 9 October (1347), and they were set forth in a memorandum, which Bartholomew was to take to the pope when the Greek embassy went to Avignon.¹⁰³

Cantacuzenus also wrote a letter to the pope, dated 22 September, 1347, praising him for his concern for eastern Christians and for organizing the *sacrum passagium* against the Turks (in fact against his faithful ally Umur Pasha!). It was in a way the letter of credence for the three Greek envoys who were going to Avignon, the *protovestiarites* George Spanopoulus, Nicholas Sigeros, and François de Pertuxo (du Pertuis?), a knight from Auvergne, who was in the service of Cantacuzenus. The three had witnessed his solemn affirmation of all the commitments he had declared himself ready to make, as set forth in the memorandum.¹⁰⁴ The date of their departure from Constantinople is not known, but it seems to have taken place several weeks after the conclusion (on 9 October) of Bartholomew of Rome's conferences with Cantacuzenus. They would presumably land at Venice, and remain there long enough to recover from the rigors of a voyage in November or December. Loenertz has suggested that Nicholas Sigeros probably met Petrarch in late January, 1348, at Verona, where the Greek mission may have stopped on the westward journey. Petrarch is known to have been in Verona at that time; on 10 February the Greek envoys are reported to have been in Milan. Sigeros was the interpreter of the mission. He and Petrarch became good friends, and some years later he sent Petrarch a Greek text of Homer, for which the poet thanked him in a letter of 10 January (1354?).¹⁰⁵

In the meantime the industrious Bartolom-

On Cantacuzenus, see the works referred to above in Chapter 9, note 93, and below in Chapter 17, note 92, and the article by C. P. Kyrris, in *Byzantina*, III (1971), 369–80, who traces the rocky road which led Cantacuzenus to the throne, and outlines the futile efforts at church union during the 1330's.

¹⁰³ The memorandum, prepared for Clement VI's own inspection, was published by Loenertz, "Ambassadeurs grecs," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XIX, 180–84, from the Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, Cod. Pal. lat. 606, fols. 1–3, in a fifteenth-century hand. That Bartholomew of Rome was to transmit the memorandum to the pope appears from another document published by Loenertz, *op. cit.*, no. III, p. 188, line 71. Cf. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 224–25.

¹⁰⁴ Loenertz, *Orient. Christ. period.*, XIX, 184–86.

¹⁰⁵ Loenertz, *Orient. Christ. period.*, XIX, 194–96.

meo de' Tomari had been carrying on negotiations for the truce, which Humbert had recommended, with Umur Pasha of "upper Smyrna" and his brother Khidr Beg of Ephesus. The Turks had requested that the old harbor fortress, which had belonged to them, should be destroyed (but not the new Christian fortifications of the lower town). Bartolommeo had brought the Turkish proposals for peace to Avignon in January, 1348; one Ottaviano Zaccaria, a kinsman of the late Martino, had apparently been instrumental in effecting a peaceful approach to the Turks. On 20 January Clement wrote to thank him for his efforts, urged him to persist in the negotiations, but warned him that the fortress must not be dismantled.¹⁰⁶ On 5 February Clement wrote Francesco Michiel, now advanced to full legatine authority, and Dieudonné de Gozon, master of the Hospital, that although the fortress might have been destroyed when the Christians first took it, for it was not of much use, its demolition now would be an offense to Christendom. Humbert, Edward of Beaujeu, the doge of Venice, and others were all of this opinion.¹⁰⁷ The truce was certainly desirable, for "we are exhausted by the heavy burdens of expense." Wars threatened in Greece. Louis of Hungary had occupied Naples. The fortress must remain standing, but after the truce the Turks could use the port for commerce, "since in some places which they hold, our people also receive the same [concession]." Clement hoped for the restoration of peace between France and England, which would ease his position immeasurably. He was sending Bartolommeo back to the East immediately, so that Michiel and Dieudonné might continue negotiations with the Turks.¹⁰⁸ Thus while Cantacuzenus wanted war with the Turks, his friend Umur

Pasha seemed interested in peace with the Christians.

Along the way or at Avignon the Greek mission prepared a memorial which on 5 March, 1348, they submitted to Clement VI. They began with the request for a *sanctum passagium* against the Turks. Cantacuzenus would contribute 15,000 to 20,000 men to a full-scale crusade, or 4,000 to a smaller expedition with some particular Turkish state as its objective, and in either case the emperor would himself accompany the Byzantine contingent. They also repeated Cantacuzenus's desire for a synod to effect ecclesiastical union, but "as to how this synod should be formed, and where, and to what end, we have nothing else in our instructions . . . except that our lord emperor has ordered us to return to him as quickly as we can in order that he may learn through us of your Holiness's precept and judgment concerning the [anti-Turkish] expeditions and concerning the synod as well. . . ." Perhaps his Holiness would be willing to send his own ambassador back with them on their return to the Bosphorus. Cantacuzenus required assistance against his enemies, and his Holiness was asked to write Stephen Dushan to give up the Greek territory which he had occupied during the period of civil war between Cantacuzenus and the court party in Byzantium.¹⁰⁹

We know nothing of the discussions which took place at the Curia and in the upper "robing room" of the papal palace, the Camera Paramenti, where Clement usually granted audiences. We do know, however, that there were five Turks in Avignon at this time, probably envoys of some sort. On 6 March (1348) a papal courier named Thomas Nicole was reimbursed for paying 10 shillings, 7 pence, for one night's lodging in his hospice for the Turks, and another courier Pierre Gautier received 42 shillings, 6 pence, for three blankets and two loads of hay which he had purchased for the Turks.¹¹⁰ On 14 April the

¹⁰⁶ Déprez and Mollat, *Clement VI: Lettres . . . intéressantes les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1, nos. 1563-64, pp. 205-6.

¹⁰⁷ Agreement on retention of the fortress at Smyrna was one of the few bonds between Humbert and Edward of Beaujeu, who were soon at war with each other (Déprez, Glénisson, and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 4, nos. 3793-94, 3813-14, 3874-75, pp. 450 ff., and cf. Valbonnays, I, 346, 348).

¹⁰⁸ Déprez, II, fasc. 4, no. 3728, p. 437. Bartolommeo de' Tomari had carried on negotiations "cum Zarabi Alti loci [Altoluogo, Ephesus] et Marbasano Smirnarum superiorum detentoribus, Turkorum ducibus." A well-known Hospitalier named Dragonet de Joyeuse (*de Gaudiosa*) is named in the pope's letter as conducting these negotiations with Bartolommeo. Cf. Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, pp. 86 ff.

¹⁰⁹ Loenertz, *Orient. Christ. period.*, XIX, 186-88.

¹¹⁰ Carrying letters, bulls, citations, and messages was only one of the many specialized functions of papal couriers, who acted as the chief purchasing agents of the Camera Apostolica (as in the present instance), served as ushers at the court and even as police and jailers, delivered summonses, had the task of overseeing the palace guards, attached papal bulls to church doors (*publicatio ad valvas*), and performed other assignments. As for the delivery of mail, the Camera frequently used the returning envoys of princes, bishops, and others as well as various trustworthy persons leaving Avignon for their own homes. Papal

Camera paid out 900 florins to the members of Cantacuzenus's embassy for the expenses of their return journey: 300 to "John the prothovestiarites," which means to George Spanopoulus; 200 to the lord Nicholas, the *interpres maior*; 200 to François "de Pertuso," the knight from Auvergne; 100 to Bishop Oddino of Chios, who had shared Cantacuzenus's confidence and the mission with Bartholomew of Rome; and, finally, 100 to Bartholomew himself, who is sometimes called "de Urbe."¹¹¹ On the following day Clement wrote John Cantacuzenus and John Palaeologus, *imperatores Grecorum illustres*, that he had received Spanopoulus, Sigeros, and François "de Pertuxo," who had brought him a chrysobull, presumably the "litterae bulla aurea munitae" recognizing the primacy and universality of the Roman Church (referred to in the memorandum of October, 1347). He had discussed the purpose of the Greek embassy with the cardinals, and would send his answer to Constantinople by his own nuncios.¹¹²

couriers, curiously enough, carried few letters, which were often entrusted to couriers employed by the great Florentine banking houses (until the bank failures of 1343–1346).

Thereafter certain innkeepers in Avignon became the chief entrepreneurs of mail delivery, receiving letters from the Camera (and the Chancery) and assigning them for delivery to free-lance couriers, who finally found steady employment at the inns, which became post offices. The innkeepers presented statements to the Camera every other month or so, depending on the extent of their bill. They could of course lodge couriers as well as dispatch them, and their inns became clearing houses of news and rumor. Thus Piero di Gieri, an innkeeper from Scarperia (near Florence), became known to the Camera as Petrus de Cursoribus (Piero de'Corieri), and was called *magister cursorum mercatorum Avenionensium*, for whose career see Y. Renouard, "Comment les papes d'Avignon expédiaient leur courrier," *Revue historique*, CLXXX (1937), 20–23, and cf. in general Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon* (1962), pp. 301–3, 579. In Clement VI's time there were between 44 and 60 papal couriers (*ibid.*, p. 304).

It is well to remember that letters often left Avignon a month or six weeks after the dates they bear. In cases of emergency professional (and sometimes papal) couriers were used, but this was very expensive, and officials of the Camera usually collected a sack of mail going to a given region before turning it over to an innkeeping postmaster such as Piero di Gieri.

¹¹¹ Loenertz, *Orient. Christ. period.*, XIX, 188; Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 359, who gives *exitus* entries for both 6 March and 14 April. "Bartholomeus de Urbe" had received 300 florins from the Camera in 1343 to accompany a Byzantine embassy back to Constantinople and "pro exequendis certis negotiis" (Schäfer, *op. cit.*, p. 232).

¹¹² The text of the letter is given in Loenertz, *op. cit.*, p. 189, and in E. Déprez and G. Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1960), no. 1626, p. 216. On 26 April Clement commended

Almost two years were to pass, however, before Clement would send an embassy to the Byzantine court,¹¹³ and in the meantime the rapid flow of events produced dramatic changes in the East, especially at Smyrna. Clement's refusal (on 5 February, 1348, as we have seen) to allow the demolition of the old fortress commanding the harbor at Smyrna doubtless led Umur Pasha to believe that it was to be used as a base for further Latin attacks upon his territory. Thereafter he could not take negotiations for a truce very seriously. He soon learned that John Cantacuzenus was preparing an expedition against Stephen Dushan. Gregoras informs us that Cantacuzenus left Constantinople in mid-spring (*μεσοῦντος ἤδη τοῦ ἔρος*) in order to muster his forces at Demotica, "and he summoned his friend Umur to come from Asia [Minor] with Turkish troops." Desiring to respond to the appeal, Umur collected a large force of foot and horse, but before setting out for Thrace and Macedonia, he wished to destroy the fortress which the Latins held at Smyrna (*τὸ ἐν Σμύρνῃ φρούριον τῶν Λατίνων*), lest they ravage his lands and commit every last outrage during his absence. At Umur's approach the Latins made a sortie from their walls, but were driven back by the larger numbers of Turks. They made fast the gates of the fortress, "and fought from the walls," says Gregoras in his epic style, "with far-ranging arrows" (*τοῖς ἐκβόλοις . . . βέλεσι*). One of them struck Umur and killed him straightway; his followers carried off his body; and his troops withdrew from the assault.¹¹⁴ Now the Latins would not be dislodged from Smyrna.

Gregoras states that Cantacuzenus was doubly distressed by the news of Umur Pasha's death, for he had lost both the Turkish reinforcements, on which he had been counting, and the faithful friend, who had always served him well. He decided to give up the Serbian expedition, according to Gregoras, because he would lack Umur's assistance, and because he

the Greek ambassadors to the Doge Andrea Dandolo, since they were sailing home from Venice (*ibid.*, no. 1629, p. 216).

¹¹³ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1961), no. 2002, p. 271, dated 31 May, 1349, and note no. 2233.

¹¹⁴ Gregoras, XVI, 6, 1–2 (Bonn, II, 834–35); Ducas, chap. 7 (Bonn, pp. 29–30); Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 227–29, relying upon Gregoras, would place the death of Umur Pasha in May, 1348; Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, pp. 105–6, would put it in June.

suffered an attack of nephritis about 21 June (*περὶ τὰς θερινὰς τοῦ ἡλίου τροπὰς*), and so if Gregoras's chronology is accurate, Umur Pasha was killed in May, 1348.¹¹⁵ He was succeeded in the emirate of Aydin (Smyrna) by his elder brother Khidr Beg, who ruled some miles to the south in Ephesus, and who soon proved more amenable than Umur to arranging a truce with the Latins.

Crusading leagues were hard to hold together, and the Venetians, who were bearing heavy expenses *in facto unionis*, were rather dissatisfied with the performance of their allies. The opinion was expressed in the Senate (on 5 July, 1348) that the other members of the league were exerting themselves less strenuously than the virtuous sons of S. Mark. The times were dangerous, and Venice herself needed men and galleys. The *sapientes* recommended, and the Senate agreed, that their captain of the league, Giustiniano Giustinian, should be ordered to return home with the three galleys which had previously left Venice for the East, leaving there, however, two other galleys which had been armed at Candia, "commanding and directing them that they must constantly maintain our honor." The duke and councillors of Crete were to see to it, therefore, that these two armed galleys had their necessary complement of men, equipment, and supplies. The two Candiote galleys were to stand guard at Smyrna, but also sometimes to go to the city and island of Negroponte for the assurance and security of the Venetian colony there, and this as often as the opportunity presented itself.¹¹⁶

The news of the Christian "victory" at Smyrna seems not to have been known in Venice at the time of the Senate's action. It apparently took a long time to reach Avignon. On 17 August, 1348, however, Clement VI wrote Archbishop Paulus of Smyrna and the young Barnaba da Parma, "captain of the city," acknowledging receipt of their letters triumphantly announcing Umur Pasha's death, of which he had already learned from a letter of Dieudonné de Gozon, master of the Hospital. It was joyous news, indeed, for which he thanked heaven, but now they must see to it that the fortress and lower town of Smyrna

(*castrum et locus Smirnarum*) were saved from ruin, and that no terms of a truce or peace included the demolition of the fortress, which Clement said he would not tolerate.¹¹⁷

On the very next day (18 August, 1348), well before Clement's letter could have left Avignon, Khidr Beg as the new emir of Aydin swore to abide by the preliminary terms of a treaty, prepared in Latin and Greek texts, to which he put his sign manual in the presence of a Greek notary. The terms had been arranged by the Hospitaller Dragonet de Joyeuse, who had collaborated with Bartolommeo de' Tomari in preparing the draft of the truce which Clement had rejected more than seven months before.¹¹⁸ Dragonet is described in the new treaty as the "ambassador and procurator" of the apostolic legate Francesco Michiel and Dieudonné de Gozon, master of the Hospital, who are themselves said merely to be representing (*habentes commissionem*) the pope and the Holy See. Khidr Beg stated that he was sending his own envoys *cum plena commissione* to the pope, who might add to or remove from the treaty any articles he wished. Khidr swore upon the Koran to observe the draft of the treaty as it stood until his envoys could return from the Curia Romana, and also to accept in advance whatever modifications the pope might choose to make in the text! First of all, among some nineteen articles, Khidr promised to grant the members of the Christian league (called the *sancta unio*)—and others to whom they might concede the right—one-half the trade of Ephesus (*de Theologo*) and all his other ports, and to treat honorably and well the Christian population in the fortress and lower town of Smyrna. He would put all his ships and galleys in dry dock, and keep them there until the return of his envoys from Avignon; in fact he agreed to burn or otherwise destroy them if the pope should so wish. If, however, Clement would grant him the boon (*si forte sanctus pater faciet gratiam*) of not burning or otherwise destroying the ships and galleys, Khidr would see to it that for the duration of the treaty they remained unarmed (*sine aliquo apparamento*), and that his people refrained from piratical attacks upon Christians. He would apprehend

¹¹⁵ Gregoras, XVI, 6, 3 (Bonn, II, 835).

¹¹⁶ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 24, fol. 79^r, inadequately and inaccurately summarized in Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 212, pp. 63–64.

¹¹⁷ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1, no. 1697, p. 229.

¹¹⁸ Déprez, Glénisson, and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 4, no. 3728, p. 437, referred to above.

and punish, to the fullest extent of his power, the pirates and corsairs of any Turkish emirate. His own people would neither harbor corsairs nor furnish them with supplies, and he would make full restitution for any Christian losses caused by such malefactors among his subjects, who were also to aid shipwrecked Christians and help salvage their cargoes. Neither he nor his subjects would assist in any way enemies of the Christian league or renegade Christians disobedient to the "sacrosanct mother Church of Rome."

Khidr Beg promised to restore to the archbishops of Smyrna and Ephesus all their churches, provide revenues for them, allow preaching and the celebration of masses, and see that they and the Christian communities received protection.¹¹⁹ He would make his people honor their commitments to Christians, protect western merchants, and maintain honest weights and measures. The members of the Christian league, Cypriotes, Venetians, and Hospitallers, were to have the right to maintain their own *consilium* and *consules* in his territory. The consuls would administer justice to their own compatriots; in cases involving a Turk and a Christian, a consul and a Turkish judge (*nayp*, i.e. *naip*) should hear the case together. All galleys of the league could put into any port in Khidr's emirate to "buy and sell" whatever was necessary for their crews, such as bread, wine, meat, and other foodstuffs, without paying any sort of impost or duty. Khidr swore to observe a previous treaty (or at least *capitula et conventiones*) which he had made with the Hospitallers, and he would return the bodies of the Latin Patriarch Henry d'Asti and the others (who had fallen in the ambushade of 17 January, 1345) whenever the Christians were ready to claim them. One of the high contracting parties might recover a slave who had escaped into the domain of the other by the payment of fifteen florins.¹²⁰ Khidr Beg must

have been hard pressed indeed to accept such terms, or perhaps he had certain reservations about observing them.

On 26 September (1348) Clement wrote Hugh IV, king of Cyprus, commending Philippe de Chambarlhac, the archbishop of Nicosia, who was about to embark for his see. He informed Hugh that he was awaiting further news of the Turkish negotiations from Michiel and de Gozon as well as the Turkish envoys who, Bartolommeo de' Tomari had told him, were being sent to Avignon. For the present he could give Hugh no further news, but he had discussed the matter with Philippe, who could report what he had said.¹²¹ Bartolommeo had just come back from "Romania et Turquia," and on 3 October he received 100 florins from the Camera for the expenses of his return voyage.¹²²

The Turkish embassy was long in reaching Avignon and long in leaving. Ottaviano Zaccaria had accompanied the Turks, who were led by "Esedin Balaban."¹²³ According to the *exitus* accounts, the Camera spent 299 florins for cloth to make clothes for the Turks, probably so that they would be less conspicuous in the streets of Avignon. Their expenses were reckoned at five florins a day for 117 days from mid-March, 1349, to early July, which amounted to 585 florins. The keeper of the tavern where they stayed received additional sums for providing beds, cooking utensils, and other services. Various other charges were incurred on their behalf, and the cameral clerk indicates in his account that he would be glad to see them gone (*et utinam recedant!*). The pope ordered that 40 florins should be divided among them, and 80 more were spent on two pieces of striped Florentine cloth as a gift for Khidr Beg, "Turkish lord of Altoluogo," to which the pope added other gifts amounting to 480 florins. As of 8 July the total expenditures appear to have amounted to 1,466 florins, and on the tenth one Simone Piccati (*Pichati*), a Florentine interpreter, was given 100 florins to escort the Turks back home.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ After the Turkish occupation of Ephesus and Smyrna at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Christian communities (often consisting of numerous slaves) had an extremely hard time, as their pastors sometimes slandered one another, fought over the sparse revenues available for their support, and had to live entirely upon the uncertain sufferance of the emirs (cf. in general Speros Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971, pp. 297-99, 316, 317, 326, 327-29, 332, 338, and esp. pp. 343-48).

¹²⁰ Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I (1880, repr. 1965), no. 168, pp. 313-17; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II (1878),

bk. IV, no. 239, p. 162; and cf. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, I (1885, repr. 1967), 543.

¹²¹ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressantes les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 1, nos. 1716-18, p. 232.

¹²² Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 386.

¹²³ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressantes les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1961), no. 2024, p. 275.

¹²⁴ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), p. 416. On 7 July, 1349,

While the Turks ate their rabbit stews, and probably went sightseeing to Nîmes, Arles, and Orange, Clement had ample opportunity to study the preliminary text of the treaty (of 18 August, 1348). But the war between France and England, the aftermath of the Black Death, the tension between Venice and Genoa, and the Hungarian invasion of the Neapolitan kingdom weighed more heavily on his mind than the affairs of Smyrna. His liberality and extravagance were beginning to cripple the Camera Apostolica, and now he tried to recover funds which had already been assigned to the crusade. On 10 April, 1349, he wrote Dieudonné de Gozon that over the last half-dozen years the Camera had paid the Hospital 110,800 florins for the support of the four papal galleys in the Aegean. The Hospitallers' accounts, however, which had just been audited in Avignon, showed that only 79,200 florins had actually been expended on the galleys, leaving a balance of 31,500 florins (actually 31,600!), which Clement now ordered returned to the Camera unless Dieudonné could show that additional sums had in fact been expended as *stipendia* for the galleys.¹²⁵

Clement's chief interest in arranging a favorable peace or truce with the Turks of Aydin was undoubtedly his dwindling treasury. As the Turkish embassy under "Esedin Balaban" was preparing to leave Avignon, and Ottaviano Zaccaria to return with them, Clement gave them a letter dated 1 July (1349) for delivery to Khidr Beg (*nobili viro Chalabi, domino Altilocci*). He wrote that he had received Khidr's envoys, read his letters, and heard his oral messages. He had then conferred with the cardinals concerning Khidr's proposals, but before he could confirm the articles of a truce, he would have to consult both the king of Cyprus and the doge of Venice, for they were members of the league, although they had not been a party to the previous negotiations. He was therefore requesting the king and the doge to send envoys to Avignon before the coming May (1350) in order to go over the texts of the articles with him, and thereafter he would write

Khidr again. In the meantime he had ordered, with the full agreement of Esedin Balaban and Zaccaria, a suspension of all hostilities until Christmas of 1350, and he urged Khidr to refrain from any sort of attack upon the Christians during this period. He was of course directing the members of the Christian league also to respect the truce, and the Florentine interpreter Simone Piccati would be able to inform him more fully about these matters.¹²⁶ On 3 July Ottaviano Zaccaria was granted the "faculty" of trading for three years in *partibus transmarinis*, which in this context means with the Moslems; he could trade in merchandise to the value of 25,000 florins, but traffic in arms and other contraband was as usual forbidden.¹²⁷ Ottaviano obviously hoped to find diplomacy more profitable than Martino Zaccaria had found warfare. Ten months later Clement had grounds for believing that Ottaviano was more interested in advancing the interests of the Turks than those of his fellow Christians.¹²⁸

For reasons that remain unclear Clement did not write to Hugh IV until some ten and a half weeks later (on 13 September, 1349) when he asked him not to allow any of his subjects to attack Khidr Beg. Hugh was to consult with his council to determine whether in their opinion the truce should be accepted or the war continued. If they chose the latter course, they must decide where the money was coming from *ad guerram proseguendam*. Clement could provide no further subsidy for the crusade; the papal treasury was exhausted, owing to the almost unimaginable financial burdens to which he had been subjected. Hugh was to send envoys to Avignon before May, 1350, in order to inform the Curia of Cypriote intentions.¹²⁹ On 29 September Clement cautioned the Hospitallers to observe the truce.¹³⁰ A week later (on 5 October) Clement sent Hugh another letter, and wrote also to Andrea Dandolo, doge of Venice, the remaining member of the Christian league. He had already sent them a copy of the proposed truce, to which he had added

Piccati received a safe-conduct to go *ad partes ultramarinas* (Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2032, p. 277).

¹²⁵ Déprez, Glénisson, and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, II, fasc. 4, no. 4130, pp. 532–33. Two weeks later (on 25 April) the Dauphin Humbert was asked to come to Avignon, possibly to confer with the pope on this as well as other matters (*ibid.*, no. 4142, p. 536).

¹²⁶ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1961), no. 2024, pp. 275–76.

¹²⁷ Déprez and Mollat, *ibid.*, no. 2028, p. 276.

¹²⁸ Déprez and Mollat, *ibid.*, no. 2189, p. 303, dated 1 May, 1350.

¹²⁹ Déprez and Mollat, *ibid.*, no. 2060, p. 282.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 2078, p. 285. The crusading tithe was still being collected in the Greek islands (no. 2070, p. 284), but it could not have amounted to much.

certain items and from which he had removed others, in accord with the right which Khidr Beg had recognized (*reservata nobis addendi et minuendi . . . plenaria potestate*). Now he sent them another copy of the truce in a form that he was prepared to accept, with "many" such addenda and deletions. In view of the coming jubilee year (1350) it had seemed appropriate to him and to almost all the cardinals to confirm the truce in the modified form. He directed Dandolo to refrain from attacks upon Aydin at least until December, 1350, for the Turks would also observe the truce until that time, and to send envoys to the Curia before the coming May to decide whether the next step would be toward peace or war. Bartolommeo de' Tomari was taking the papal letter to Venice; he could fill in the whole background against which Clement was acting. If the Venetians chose to continue the war, they must (like Hugh and the Hospitallers) consider where the necessary money was coming from. Another crusading subsidy was beyond Clement's resources.¹³¹ Bertrand du Poujet, cardinal bishop of Ostia and Velletri and sometime legate in northern Italy, also wrote the doge, urging him to send envoys to the Curia promptly, and telling him that Bartolommeo was carrying letters concerning the truce to Hugh and to the Hospitallers.¹³²

After the arrival of Clement's letter of 5 October, the Venetian Senate met on Saturday, 24 October, and decided that the answer and the dispatch of an envoy to the Curia were matters of such importance that they should be held over until the following Tuesday, the twenty-seventh, when the Senate would convene "after the ninth hour" (about 4 A.M. in October!). Absence from the meeting would be attended by a fine of twenty soldi.¹³³ On the twenty-

seventh the Senate set about the election of an envoy who, after commending the Republic to his Holiness with the usual formalities, was to describe to him the "miserable and weak condition of the city of Smyrna and of the Christians dwelling there as well as of the other Christians in the islands and districts of Greece." The perfidious Turks were planning the reoccupation of Smyrna and the complete destruction of Christianity. Their courage had grown, and their strength returned, as soon as they had seen the allied fleets withdraw from the region. Smyrna had been acquired at the cost of Christian blood and treasure, and honor required that it be defended to the last. Such was the resolution passed in the Senate with only one dissenting vote, and such was to be the Venetian answer to Clement and the other members of the holy league.¹³⁴

On 30 October (1349) the Senate turned to Clement's letter of the fifth and Bertrand du Poujet's of the tenth as well as to the report of Bartolommeo de' Tomari, and accepted a text prepared by the *sapientes* to be sent to Avignon as the doge's answer. Professing the greatest devotion to his Holiness, Andrea Dandolo was to write that Venice would obey him both in sending envoys to the Curia within the prescribed time (May, 1350) and in observing the postponement of naval or military action against the Turks (until Christmas, 1350) provided the latter, who were devoid of honesty, observed the truce themselves. But Dandolo had already warned his Holiness that the Turks were breaking the truce, "because they have gone out and they do go out every day with their ships and barks [with a view] to the occupation and destruction of the city of

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, no. 2080, p. 285; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 172, pp. 345-46; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 295, p. 174.

¹³² Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 173, pp. 346-47, dated 10 October, 1349, and Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 297, p. 174, who incorrectly identifies the cardinal of Ostia as Pierre de Colombier. On Cardinal Bertrand du Poujet, cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 15, 36, and above, Chapter 9, note 94. A memorandum of allied, chiefly Venetian, concessions to Khidr Beg in the proposed treaty of 18 August, 1348, is given in Thomas, I, no. 169, p. 318, and Predelli, II, bk. IV, no. 260, p. 167. There seems to be no evidence of the alterations which Clement VI made in the treaty (cf. Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient*, p. 90).

¹³³ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 25, fol. 59r.

dated 24 October, 1349: "Capta: Quoniam ista negotia que tractantur de mittendo ambaxatorem ad Curiam pro isto facto Smirnarum sunt magna et ardua, et bonam et solempnem deliberationem requirunt ut cogitari et deliberari valeat quid sit melius domino concedente, vadit pars quod induciatur hoc negotium usque ad diem martis proximam post nonam, qua die et hora vocetur hoc consilium sub pena soldorum viginti, et fiet sicut videbitur."

¹³⁴ Misti, Reg. 25, fo. 60v: "Et facta eidem [domino nostro pape] humili et solenti commendatione de nobis et communitate nostra exponere debeat . . . miserabilem et debilem condicionem tam loci Smirnarum et Christianorum in eodem degentium quam aliorum Christicolarum insularum et partium Romanie et iniquum et sceleste propositum quod habent perfidi Turchi ad occupationem et delectionem dicti loci et exterminium ac destructionem totius fidei Christiane et maximam audaciam ac vigorem quem sumpserunt postquam revocatas viderunt armatas sacratissime unionis. . . ."

Smyrna and of the Christians dwelling there. . . ."¹³⁵ On 17 November the Senate informed a Byzantine envoy of the meeting scheduled for the following May to decide upon peace or war with the Turks, and left little doubt that they preferred war as the only means of saving Greece from destruction.¹³⁶

Clement VI wanted to retain the lower fortress at Smyrna, as we have seen, for some day it might serve as a focal point for assembling crusaders who could extend the Latin hold on the Anatolian littoral. There was no hope, however, of doing this for some time to come. France and England were intermittently at war, and Venice and Genoa were moving toward war themselves.¹³⁷ When the Venetian ambassadors came to Avignon, in answer to the papal summons, in April, 1350,¹³⁸ Clement found them (not surprisingly) ready to continue the anti-Turkish league, but they now desired the "concurrence" of the Genoese in the enterprise, and on 7 May Clement tried to get the Genoese to join their rivals in a new undertaking against the Turks.¹³⁹ It was a vain effort. The breach between Venice and Genoa had been widening for the preceding three or four months, to Clement's consternation, for it was clear that war between the two maritime republics would make the defense of Smyrna exceedingly difficult.¹⁴⁰ Nevertheless, when the ambassadors of Hugh IV and Dieudonné de Gozon arrived in Avignon, and discussions began in earnest, it seems clear that the peace which Khidr Beg offered his Christian opponents was not accepted.

On 11 August (1350) the ambassadors gathered at Villeneuve, which they doubtless found

cooler than Avignon, just across the Rhone, and agreed to a pact extending the league for another ten years to protect their principals' Levantine possessions and to carry on war against the Turks. Cyprus would furnish two armed galleys, and the Hospital and Venice each three, which were to serve under a papal legate, who would preside over a council of war to be composed of the captains of the various galleys. These galleys were to assemble at Negroponte in January of the coming year, and were not to be used for commercial purposes. Violation of the terms of the agreement would carry a penalty of 10,000 florins, to be paid to the Camera Apostolica. The pope was to ratify the pact and to request the king of Cyprus, the master of the Hospital, and the doge of Venice to do likewise.¹⁴¹

Although the Venetian Senate had been prepared to maintain three galleys as their contribution to the league, they were unwilling to involve themselves in the defense of Smyrna. After all, three out of eight galleys were "much more than the quarter" which they had hitherto contributed. On 7 August the Senate had passed a resolution to the effect that the ambassadors should give the pope such "excuses" as seemed best for their stand on the question of Smyrna and return home.¹⁴² Caught between a recalcitrant Senate and a strong-minded pope, the ambassadors were in a difficult situation. A few weeks later (on 31 August) they sent the Doge Andrea Dandolo a copy of the pact to which they had subscribed twenty days before. Their discussions at the Curia had not gone smoothly. They had had to explain to Cardinals Hugues Roger (the pope's brother), Étienne Aubert (later Innocent VI), and Guy de Boulogne why Venice declined to participate in the "custody" of Smyrna. When their position was reported to the pope, he

¹³⁵ Misti, Reg. 25, fol. 61^r.

¹³⁶ Misti, Reg. 25, fol. 65^v, and cf. the hasty summary in Thiriet, *Régestes*, I (1958), no. 231, p. 67.

¹³⁷ On Clement's efforts to make peace between Venice and Genoa, cf. Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2107, p. 291, dated 24 November, 1349, and note no. 2269; and Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 303, p. 175.

¹³⁸ On 18 March the Venetian ambassadors were preparing to leave for the Curia Romana for consultations "super negotio unionis . . . et treuguarum tractatarum cum Zalabi domino Theologi" [i.e. Khidr Beg, lord of Ephesus]: Venice was willing to observe the truce, but claimed Khidr Beg was not doing so himself, and was aiming at the reoccupation of Smyrna (Misti, Reg. 26, fols. 8^r ff.).

¹³⁹ Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2193, pp. 304-5.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Misti, Reg. 25, fol. 73^r, a letter of Andrea Dandolo to Clement, dated 8 January, 1350, in answer to a papal letter of 24 November (summarized in Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2107, p. 291). Cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 235, p. 68.

¹⁴¹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 352, p. 184; Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, III, fasc. 5 (1959), no. 4661, pp. 116-17 (cited hereafter as Déprez, III, fasc. 5).

¹⁴² Misti, Reg. 26, fol. 42^v, dated 7 August, 1350: "Quia tempus presens non patitur propter condiciones nostras intromittere nos in custodia Smirnarum, vadit pars quod scribatur nostris ambaxatoribus quod tum quia numquam habuimus aliquam partem in Smirnis tum quia contribuimus unioni tres galeas de VIII. que sunt multo plus quam quartum quod alias contribuebamus, et pro aliis multis respectibus non videtur nobis ullo modo assumere aliquod onus in custodiam ipsarum, et propterea volumus quod excusando nos cum hiis et aliis rationibus que sibi videbuntur . . . Venecias revertantur."

became angry. The harassed ambassadors had also taken the opportunity to complain to the cardinals of the losses which Venetians were suffering at Genoese hands while the differences at issue between the two states were being aired before the pope, who (they reported to Dandolo) was much disturbed, and promised to make every effort to put an end to the alleged Genoese aggression.¹⁴³ Thereafter (on 11 September), when the pope wrote Hugh IV of Cyprus, Dieudonné de Gozon, and Dandolo, asking them to ratify the anti-Turkish pact, he made a strong point with Dandolo of demanding that Venice contribute a fourth part of the funds necessary to protect Smyrna against Khidr Beg.¹⁴⁴

In May, 1350, the Venetians had been still willing to continue the offensive against the Turks despite the mounting tension with Genoa.¹⁴⁵ The Republic's ambassadors at the Curia reported to the Senate the pope's hopes of preserving peace with Genoa,¹⁴⁶ but it was no use, and on 5 October the Senate informed a papal envoy that they had tolerated Genoese affronts long enough. War was inevitable, and Venice could not meet the pope's expectations of assistance against the Turks.¹⁴⁷ So it went from week to week. Now the Venetians would not even provide the three galleys they had agreed to in the "conventions and promises" made in the doge's name (on 11 August, 1350), for which Clement chided Andrea Dandolo in a letter of 13 January, 1351. Dandolo had informed Clement that Venetian galleys could not engage safely in anti-Turkish operations because war now existed between his state and Genoa. Clement replied that Venice was honor-bound to keep her word. Otherwise King Hugh of Cyprus and the Hospitallers would relax their own efforts; Raymond Saquet, bishop of Théroutanne and now papal legate, would be left helpless in the East, to the

grave danger of the faithful and the opprobrium of the Holy See; and the doge would *non immerito* be charged with the failure of the crusade and the misfortunes which would befall the faithful. He urged Dandolo to fulfill his obligation to furnish the three galleys, which (being under papal protection) the Genoese would certainly not attack. (If Clement believed this, Dandolo did not.) However, if Venice would pay the necessary *stipendia*, three non-Venetian galleys might be leased, which would obviously have no fear of attack by the Genoese.¹⁴⁸

At the same time Clement wrote Dandolo that he was having 3,000 florins sent to Bartolommeo Spiafamis, a papal banker and merchant of Lucca, to be turned over to the procurators of S. Mark, and asked the doge to see to the safe transmission of the funds to the legate Raymond Saquet for the defense of Smyrna. He thanked Dandolo, who appears also to have contributed 3,000 florins for the same purpose.¹⁴⁹ But if the Venetians would not send their galleys into Smyrniote waters, it was all the more important that the Cypriotes and Hospitallers should do so, for Raymond Saquet had already arrived in the East, and expected and needed their help.¹⁵⁰

Dandolo apparently did not answer Clement's letters of 13 January (1351) until 31 March. He assured his Holiness that the Venetians desired with all their hearts to fulfill every promise their ambassadors had made with respect to the anti-Turkish league. But war with the treacherous Genoese presented a very serious danger to Venice, as he had more than once informed his Holiness, and while Venice had always sought the well-being and augmentation of the faith, she must also look to her own safety. The pope's 3,000 florins were being sent to Smyrna, as he had directed.¹⁵¹ Before Dandolo's letter had reached Avignon, Clement had learned that Genoese galleys had landed on the island of Naxos, and captured Janulli

¹⁴³ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 354, p. 185.

¹⁴⁴ Déprez and Mollat, *Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1961), nos. 2299–2300, pp. 320–21; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 176, pp. 349–50; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. IV, no. 356, p. 185.

¹⁴⁵ Two months earlier, on 8 March, 1350, the Senate had considered the "iniurie, gravitates, molestie, lesiones, et dampna que nobis intulerunt Ianuenses et inferre cotidie non desistunt" (Misti, Reg. 26, fol. 4^r), and note, *ibid.*, fols. 29^v, 30 ff., 42, et *alibi*, and Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, nos. 242, 244–46, 248, 250.

¹⁴⁶ Misti, Reg. 26, fol. 37^r, dated 12 July, 1350.

¹⁴⁷ Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 250, p. 71.

¹⁴⁸ G. M. Thomas (and Riccardo Predelli), *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II (1899, repr. 1965), no. 1, pp. 1–2, and Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2378, p. 332. Raymond Saquet was finally made legate in the East on 26 June, 1350 (Déprez, III, fasc. 5, nos. 4587–88, p. 99).

¹⁴⁹ Thomas, II, no. 2, pp. 2–3, dated 13 January, 1351; Déprez and Mollat, *Lettres . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2, no. 2379, pp. 332–33, with an inadequate summary, and note no. 2380, p. 333.

¹⁵⁰ Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2377, p. 332, also dated 13 January, 1351.

¹⁵¹ Misti, Reg. 26, fol. 54^v.

Sanudo, duke of the Archipelago (*dux Agio-pelagi*), together with his family. The Genoese had seized some of his castles, plundered his possessions and those of his subjects, and spread destruction throughout the island by fire. On 10 April, Clement demanded of the Genoese that they release Janulli and his family and freely return his castles and lands to him. Janulli had never done the Genoese any harm, and he had already shown himself to be a champion against the Turks.¹⁵²

The Genoese were certainly not lacking in aggression, and Khidr Beg had been quick to make overtures to them. The Genoese response came in the form of an embassy, which was sent to Ephesus as well as to the Genoese colonies at Chios, Pera, and Caffa. Two nobles went on the mission, Oberto Gattilusio and Raffo Erminio; they went as "syndics" of the doge or governor of Genoa, Giovanni de' Valenti; and their instructions are dated 26 May, 1351. They were to go to Ephesus (*ad Altum Locum*),

because the lord there, Ihalabi [Khidr Beg], as you know, has been very well disposed, and has shown the best will towards all Genoese: he has written a good deal to us officially, offering his services for anything he could do for us. This is good, and we wish that when . . . you get there, you take care to enter his presence by making him the proper salutation and act of reverence on our behalf and that of the commune, according to the custom of those oriental lords, and thank him for his good will and the love which he has shown toward us and all Genoese. . . .

Having paid their respects to Khidr Beg, the two syndics were then to arrange with the Genoese consul and merchants at Ephesus to prepare and send to nearby Chios a large quantity of sea biscuits whenever the Chians should request them.¹⁵³ Considering the rapprochement which thus existed between Khidr Beg and the Genoese, it is small wonder that Venice did not wish to allow her galleys to continue in the service of the Christian league against Khidr. It was better to deal with one enemy at a time, besides which Venice (quite as

much as Genoa) preferred to remain at peace with the emirs for obvious commercial reasons.¹⁵⁴

The Latin colony in Smyrna lived under constant siege, and was probably demoralized. Clement directed the legate Raymond Saquet to institute an inquiry into the "enormous crimes" being attributed at the Curia to a certain Francis, who is referred to as the archbishop of Smyrna¹⁵⁵ (a nominee of the local chapter?). The Christian league was falling apart. On 1 February, 1351, Clement wrote Raymond Saquet again that the 3,000 florins which he had sent as the Church's share of the costs of defending Smyrna should be expended to do so, but for the rest Raymond could decide himself whether it seemed better to return home or to remain in the East.¹⁵⁶ Everything was going wrong. No love was lost between Venice and the Hospitallers, and on 15 May Clement warned the master Dieudonné de Gozon that he had heard the Hospitallers might be aiding the Genoese in the maritime warfare that was disrupting the Aegean world. The Hospital was to remain absolutely neutral.¹⁵⁷ As the plague ravaged Cyprus in the summer of 1351, Clement ordered the archbishop of Nicosia and his suffragans to stop preaching the crusade, for the island kingdom was surrounded by Moslems and it must not be divested of warriors.¹⁵⁸ The "crusade" had come to an end, and Clement was only too well aware of the fact.

On 8 September, 1351, Clement released the master and convent of the Hospital at Rhodes from their agreement to maintain three galleys against the Turks, because the league had now failed (*quia unio effectum non habuit*), but they were still required to pay 3,000 florins for the defense of Smyrna. Hugh IV of Cyprus was relieved of the obligation to pay 10,000 florins to which he was committed for the same

¹⁵² Déprez and Mollat, I, fasc. 2, no. 2417, p. 337. Janulli or Giovanni I Sanudo was the duke of Naxos from 1341 to 1362 (Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 480).

¹⁵³ Angelo Sanguineti and Gerolamo Bertolotto, "Nuova Serie di documenti sulle relazioni di Genova coll' impero bizantino," in the *Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria*, XXVIII (Genoa and Rome, 1896-1902), doc. xxiii, esp. pp. 550-51, and cf. Camillo Manfroni, "Le Relazioni fra Genova, l'impero bizantino e i Turchi," *ibid.*, pp. 705 ff.

¹⁵⁴ Heyd, I, 543-44, and Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin* (1957), pp. 233-34.

¹⁵⁵ Déprez, III, fasc. 5, no. 4855, p. 156, dated 13 January, 1351.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 4865, p. 162.

¹⁵⁷ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressantes les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2, no. 2426, p. 339. To the day he died, Clement continued his efforts to make peace between Venice and Genoa (*ibid.*, nos. 2269, 2457, 2466, 2511-14, 2518, 2589, 2598, 2605, 2669-71, and Déprez, III, fasc. 5, nos. 5250-51, 5358, 5465).

¹⁵⁸ Déprez and Mollat, *Clément VI: Lettres . . . intéressantes les pays autres que la France*, I, fasc. 2, no. 2496, p. 351, dated 8 September, 1351.

purpose.¹⁵⁰ Clement wanted a final reckoning with Dieudonné de Gozon of some 32,000 florins which the Camera Apostolica had sent the Hospital for payments of *stipendia* to the crews and men-at-arms on the papal galleys.¹⁶⁰

And thereupon references to the crusade and the anti-Turkish league end abruptly in Clement's correspondence, as he turned his attention to the affairs of Italy and his beloved France. He died on Thursday, 6 December, 1352, after recurrent illnesses. The following spring, when the roads became passable, a majestic funeral cortège set out from Avignon with five cardinals, eight archbishops, six bishops, various abbots, and feudal lords, who accompanied the pope's body by way of Le Puy to the Benedictine abbey of Chaise Dieu, where he had spent his youth. The cortège, which cost 5,000 florins, arrived at the Chaise Dieu (*Casa Dei*) on 8 April, 1353, and Clement was laid to

rest in a tomb of black and white marble and alabaster. His recumbent figure in white marble, the triple tiara on his head, palms apposed in prayer, and little lions at his feet, still lies atop the black marble table of the sepulcher, which was once surrounded by fifty-four small statues, mostly of his relatives, whom he had made cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and rich magnates. The work on the tomb was done by Pierre Roye and his helpers, and the costs are still on record in the *exitus* accounts of the Camera.¹⁶¹ A strong pope, Clement has left the mark of his personality on the documents. He had been determined to hold Smyrna, and he did so. In fact the city remained in Christian hands until December, 1402, when the forces of Timur the Lame took it from a Hospitaller garrison after a two weeks' siege, a half-century almost to the day after Clement's death.

¹⁵⁰ Déprez, *Clément VI: Lettres se rapportant à la France*, III, fasc. 5, nos. 5051–54, 5056, pp. 210–11.

¹⁶⁰ Déprez, III, fasc. 5, no. 5060, p. 212, dated 13 September, 1351.

¹⁶¹ Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 286–87, 451–52, 467, 481–82, 522, and cf. Pierre-Roger Gaussin, *L'Abbaye de la Chaise-Dieu (1043–1518)*, Paris, 1962, pp. 431–32. Counting the large effigy of the pope, the tomb was an ensemble of fifty-five statues (Schäfer, *op. cit.*, p. 452): "Summa ymaginum computata ymagine pape: 55 ymagines."

11. PIERRE THOMAS AND PETER I OF CYPRUS, THE CRUSADE AND THE REVOLT OF CRETE (1352–1364)

ON 16 DECEMBER, 1352, twenty-five cardinals assembled in the papal palace at Avignon to elect a successor to Clement VI. They were isolated with their attendants or "conclavists" on the upper floor of the palace, in the banqueting hall (*magnum tinellum*), whence they had easy access to the robing room (*camera paramenti*) on the south and to the guest rooms in the old western or "conclave wing," which Benedict XII had built. They voted in the little Chapel of S. Martial, off the banqueting hall, under the frescoes which Matteo Giovanetti had painted in 1344–1345, and which are still well preserved today. The accommodations were spacious and pleasant, but the conclave did not last long, for on 18 December the cardinals elected the Limousin canonist Étienne Aubert, cardinal-bishop of Ostia and Velletri, as Pope Innocent VI.¹ The new pope added a measure of austerity to the Curia, pursued the Fraticelli with unrelenting severity, embarked upon the reform of the Dominicans, and threatened the Hospitallers with the loss of property and the formation of a new military order if they did not show much more fight against the Turks.

Innocent VI was to have a hard decade as pope (1352–1362), and although his letters show him to have been dedicated to the war against the Turks, he was distracted by the costly struggle to reassert papal sovereignty over the states of the Church in Italy and (from 1357) by the incursions of the "grand companies" (of unemployed mercenaries) which harried Provence and threatened Avignon. He naturally continued his predecessor's efforts to make

peace between France and England²—and between Venice and Genoa.³ As always peace among the European powers was regarded (and quite rightly) as the necessary first step toward organizing an expedition against the Turks. Occasionally a knightly pilgrim made his way to Jerusalem to see the Holy Sepulcher and the other sacred *oratoria* in the Holy Land,⁴ but the war between Venice and Genoa made conditions in the Levant increasingly insecure. The maritime raids of Turks from the Anatolian emirates also made every pilgrimage an extreme hazard, such as only the most pious or the most foolhardy would dare undertake.

Toward the end of Clement's reign two envoys had appeared in Avignon as representatives of the clergy and people of the Byzantine city of Philadelphia in Asia Minor. They had appealed to Clement for aid against the "incessant and inhuman" attacks of the Turks. The Philadelphians were said to be ready to turn over their city and its fortifications to the Holy See and forever to obey *quoad temporalia* the pope and the Latin Church. Clement had heard their plea with full compassion, we are told, but he had taken to heart not only their temporal but also their spiritual needs. The clergy and people of Philadelphia should abjure their "ancient schism" and return to the bosom of the Latin Church, as Innocent VI wrote them on 19 January, 1353, for only thus could they find grace and salvation. Innocent had summoned the two envoys to come before him and the cardinals, and had asked them whether their mandate included authority to deal with the basic problems of schism, ecclesiastical union, and recognition of the primacy of the Latin Church. They

¹ Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914–22, I, 309, 331, 343, and vol. II, pp. 434–41; Ludwig Mohler, ed., *Die Einnahmen der Apostolischen Kammer unter Klemens VI.*, Paderborn, 1931, p. 315; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1352, nos. 21, 25–27, vol. VI (vol. XXV of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1750), pp. 564 ff.; Martin Souchon, *Die Papstwahlen von Bonifaz VIII. bis Urban VI. und die Entstehung des Schismas 1378*, Brunswick, 1888, pp. 55–66; and note especially the discussion of the election of 1352 in Norman P. Zacour, *Talleyrand: The Cardinal of Périgord (1301–1364)*, Philadelphia, 1960, pp. 21–24 (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s., vol. 50, pt. 7); see also G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon (1305–1378)*, 9th ed., Paris, 1949, pp. 97 ff.

² Pierre Gasnault and M. H. Laurent, eds., *Innocent VI: Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 1 (Paris, 1959), nos. 17–19, 83–84, 253, 272, 275, 284; vol. I, fasc. 2 (1960), nos. 336, 436–40, 465–68; vol. II, fasc. 3 (1962), nos. 730, 943, 945, 1026; and vol. III, fasc. 4 (1968), nos. 1389–91, 1394–95, 1397.

³ *Ibid.*, I, fasc. 1, nos. 232–33, pp. 77–78, dated 22 April, 1353, and see also vol. I, fasc. 2, nos. 569–71, 577, 663, 668–69, 672; vol. III, fasc. 4, nos. 1454, 1456–57.

⁴ Gasnault, II, fasc. 3, no. 1244, p. 205, dated 19 December, 1354, papal letters of commendation for Robert de Lorry, a chamberlain of King John of France, to the king of Cyprus and the master of the Hospital.

replied that they had no such authority. Although Innocent and the cardinals were deeply moved by the afflictions which the Philadelphians were suffering at the hands of the Turks, spiritual union with the Latin Church must precede temporal aid from the Latin West. Innocent therefore urged the Philadelphians to send back to the Curia, with all possible speed, envoys "with full and sufficient mandate" to abjure the schism and to recognize the Roman primacy. Then Innocent would send them help to the fullest extent he could with the favor of God, who had saved the Israelites by drowning Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea (Exodus, 14), and thus would the audacity of the Turks be checked, their fury spent, and their iniquity suppressed.⁵ So at any rate Innocent informed the clergy and people of Philadelphia, but surely the Holy See had all it could do to hold on to Smyrna.

Overtures soon came from Constantinople more striking than those which the Philadelphians had made. In March, 1354, the Ottoman Turks seized Gallipolis (Gallipoli) after an earthquake, and all Thrace lay open to their attack. On the following 22 November, as fear reigned in Constantinople, John V Palaeologus drove his Turcophile rival John Cantacuzenus from the throne into a monastery. John V owed his success to the stalwart assistance of the Genoese adventurer Francesco Gattilusio, who received as his reward the hand of the young emperor's sister Maria Palaeologina and the island lordship of Lesbos.⁶ On 15 December, 1355, John V

signed a remarkable (and well-known) chrysobull binding himself to secure the obedience of the Greek Church to the Holy See in return for military aid against the Turks. He asked Pope Innocent to put 5 galleys and 15 transports, 500 horse and 1,000 foot at his disposal for six months, within which time he would make Latin Catholicism the official religion of Byzantium. He would also promote Latin culture, especially the Latin language, by establishing three Latin colleges where he would encourage the sons of Greek notables to study.

As evidence of his good faith, John V proposed to send his second son Manuel to Avignon as a hostage, and he wanted the pope to send a large army into the Levant, provide funds for warfare against the Turks, and make him commander of the Christian forces to be deployed in a great crusade. The promises and requests set forth in the chrysobull of 1355 were made in close consultation with Archbishop Paulus of Smyrna, who is named in the text, and who obtained the further concession of permanent residence in Constantinople for a papal legate, to whom the emperor would give both a palace and a church.⁷ John V would need military assistance against the Turks more than he realized at the time his chrysobull was composed, for on 20 December (1355) Stephen Dushan died, and the rapid dissolution of the Graeco-Serbian empire he had put together meant that no Christian state was left in the Balkans strong enough to stem the rising tide

⁵ Gasnault and Laurent, I, fasc. 1, no. 71, pp. 24–26; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1353, nos. 20–21, vol. VI (XXV, Lucca, 1750), pp. 585–86, and cf. the remarks of Paul Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident*, Paris, 1957, pp. 236–37. The two envoys from Philadelphia were Emanuel de Magula and Emanuel Theodorucanus, and as usual the Apostolic Camera made provision for their support while they were in Avignon (K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI. [1335–1362]*, Paderborn, 1914, p. 483).

⁶ The Gattilusi were to rule in Lesbos from July, 1355, to September, 1462 (Wm. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, pp. 313–49). A glimpse into Ottoman society and life at Orkhan's court in the year 1355 is provided by the hesychast theologian Gregory Palamas's own "epistle to the Thessalonians," which G. G. Arnakis has made the subject of an interesting article: "Gregory Palamas among the Turks and Documents of his Captivity as Historical Sources," *Speculum*, XXVI (1951), 104–18, and note also his monograph on *The First Ottomans: A Contribution to the Problem of the Decline of Hellenism in Asia Minor* [in Greek], Athens, 1947. As late as the mid-fourteenth century the Ottomans, who were actually very tolerant in religious matters and generous in alms-giving, still preserved

some of their earlier nomadic customs, preferring to reside in tents rather than in houses and palaces. Ottoman domination was, however, certainly causing the decline of "Hellenism in Asia Minor," as Palamas's account makes clear, and he found the city of Nicaea in sad decay. On this subject, note also the work of Speros Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971, referred to above, Chapter 10, note 119.

⁷ Aug. Theiner and Fr. Miklosich, *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem ecclesiarum graecae et romanae*, Vienna, 1872, pp. 29–37; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1355, nos. 33–37, vol. VI (Lucca, 1750), pp. 630–32; Oskar Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (1355–1375)*, Warsaw, 1930; London, 1972, pp. 31–38; Joachim Smet, ed., *The Life of St. Peter Thomas by Philippe de Mézières*, Rome, 1954, pp. 201–3 (Textus et studia historica Carmelitana, vol. II). On attempts to effect the union of the Churches during the first half of the fourteenth century, cf. K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), pp. 40–45, with the literature cited, and on the archiepiscopal see of Smyrna, see Conrad Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 456, and Giorgio Fedalto, *La Chiesa latina in Oriente*, I (Verona, 1973), 479–81, with refs.

of Ottoman expansion. But if Dushan had lived, John would soon have been appealing to the Holy See to aid him against Serbian aggression. All his life, wherever he turned, he faced insoluble problems.

John chose Archbishop Paulus and Nicholas Sigeros, grand hetairiarch of the Byzantine court, as his envoys to take his "golden bull" to Avignon. Ecclesiastics and courtiers were usually not enthusiastic about the wintry seas; Paulus and Sigeros apparently delayed their departure until Easter; in any event they arrived in Avignon before the octave of Pentecost (12–19 June, 1356). Their little galley had come up the Rhone, and landed them near the church of S. Mary of the Miracles, near the "Campus Floris" where, during the great plague of eight years before, bodies had been piled high when there was no room in the city cemeteries.⁸

Innocent's reply is dated 21 July (1356), showing that John's chrysobull and letters of credence for Paulus and Nicholas Sigeros received prompt attention at the Curia. The pope acknowledged receipt of the *littere . . . aurea bulla tua et imperialis manus subscriptione munite*, and commended John's solemn expression of devotion to the papacy, his expressed willingness to receive legates and nuncios from Avignon, "and [that] you would make every effort to the best of your ability to see that all the peoples under your imperial authority and subject to your jurisdiction, whether laity or clergy, of whatever condition, status, or dignity, should be faithful, obedient, reverent, and devoted to us and to our successors. . . ." *Hec, princeps inclite, tue conversionis initia, hec devotionis primordia, hec firma fidei fundamenta!* Innocent and the cardinals were overjoyed to hear John's chrysobull read [in consistory], and they exulted in John's long-desired and expected return to ecclesiastical unity as well as in the promised conversion of the vast multitude of his subjects. The pope's letter contains a good deal of theological and hortatory rhetoric, but he did take note of John's appeal for aid against Turkish attacks and against the audacity of the [Cantacuzenist]

"rebels" within his empire. Upon his conversion to Catholicism the Church would come to John's aid with spiritual weapons, and would seek the support of the Christian princes on his behalf. But what a long letter could not say, nuncios could, and Innocent stated that he was sending the Carmelite Pierre Thomas, bishop of Patti (in Sicily), and the Dominican Guglielmo Conti, bishop of Sisopolis (Sizebolu in Thrace), as his nuncios, and it was they of course who were to take the pope's letter to Constantinople.⁹ Presumably the two nuncios would discuss with the emperor his unrealistic promises of church union, which he clearly could not keep, in return for substantial assistance against the Turks, which the pope clearly could not furnish.

Pierre Thomas had become a familiar figure at the Curia Romana, a friend of Cardinal Talleyrand of Périgord. By now he was almost famous in Europe and in the Balkans, having just spent a useless year in Serbia trying to persuade Stephen Dushan to subject Serbian Orthodoxy to the authority of the Latin Church.¹⁰ Pierre's appointment as nuncio to the Byzantine

⁸ I have used the handsomely written text in the Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Aven. 238, fols. 140^v–142^r; it may also be found in Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, 3rd ed. by J. M. Fonseca et al., VIII (Quaracchi, 1932), 127–28; and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1356, nos. 33–34, vol. VII (Lucca, 1752), pp. 17–19. Pierre Thomas was named bishop of Patti and Lipari by the bull *Pastoralis officii*, "datum Avinione XV Kal. Decembr. anno secundo" [17 November, 1354], which may be found in Reg. Aven. 126, fol. 75 (cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 384), and more legibly in Reg. Vat. 225, fol. 57. Guglielmo Conti had been appointed bishop of Sisopolis on 20 July (1356), the day before his assignment to the Constantinopolitan mission. Conti succeeded a certain Ambrosius, *qui in partibus illis diem clausit extremum* (Reg. Aven. 134, fols. 75^v–76^r, and cf. Eubel, I, 188). Conti was long erroneously assumed to be a Franciscan, but was actually a Dominican (Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente francescano*, III [Quaracchi, 1919], 300).

On 11 August (1356) Pierre Thomas received 500 florins from the Camera for the expenses of his mission to Constantinople (Schäfer, *Ausgaben* [1914], p. 607), and he and Conti were also granted "procurations" of six gold florins a day (Reg. Vat. 238, fols. 130^r, 131^r), which would amount to 72 *turonenses* in silver, according to the rate established by Benedict XII on 18 December, 1336, in the bull *Vas electionis*, which limited in detail the sums to be collected in procurations (*Corpus iuris canonici, Extravagantes communes*, lib. III, tit. 10, ed. E. L. Richter and Emil Friedberg, II [Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1955], cols. 1280–84).

¹⁰ Cf. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, VIII (1932), 108 ff.; Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, pp. 22–27; Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 64–65, 67–70, 193–96; Frederick J. Boehlke, Jr., *Pierre de Thomas, Scholar, Diplomat, and Crusader*, Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 83–100.

⁹ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 334, and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1356, no. 32, vol. VII (vol. XXVI of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1752), p. 17. Nicholas Sigeros received gifts from the pope costing some 286 florins, which were entered in the account of the Camera on 30 June, 1356 (Schäfer, *Ausgaben* [1914], pp. 605–6, where Sigeros is called "Bayssaereartus"), and on 18 July Paulus of Smyrna was paid 200 florins "for his expenses" (*ibid.*).

court is first alluded to in two letters dated 14 July (1356) when Innocent granted him an indulgence to confer holy orders in his diocese of Patti and in that of Messina, provided he did so in private ceremonies with no excommunicated or interdicted persons present (*ianuis tamen clausis, voce summissa, excommunicatis et interdictis exclusis*), although Sicily was and had long been under the interdict for what the Curia regarded as the Catalan usurpation of the island. Pierre hoped to visit his diocese either on his way to Constantinople or on his return. A second indulgence allowed him to celebrate mass publicly (*alta voce*) three times in Patti and Messina, with open doors and the ringing of bells, but all excommunicants must be rigorously excluded from the services although interdicted persons were of course to be admitted.¹¹

Innocent lost no time in alerting the Christian maritime powers of the coming need to aid John V against the Turks, for on 17 July (1356) the chancery prepared letters for dispatch to Hugh IV of Cyprus, the master and convent of the Hospitallers, and the governments of Venice and Genoa. Innocent joyfully informed them all that the searching light of true doctrine had illumined John's decision to eschew the schismatic errors of the Greek past and to recognize the primacy of the Roman See. When he had ratified the fact of his conversion in the presence of Pierre Thomas or Guglielmo Conti, the recipients of the papal letters must help protect him from the restless insanity of the infidels' aggression.¹² But since the members of the Christian league in the Levant seemed to be having all they could do to defend Smyrna from attacks being launched by the declining Anatolian emirates, they were not likely to afford Byzantium much protection against the increasing power of the Ottomans.

Pierre Thomas's departure for Constantinople, however, as well as the prospect of his celebrating mass in Patti, were both delayed when Innocent decided that, since Pierre would go east by way of Venice, he should also serve as nuncio to Venice and Hungary, for after an eight years' truce war had again broken out between them in their struggle for control of the Dalmatian coast. Pierre spent some six months, from

the fall of 1356 to the following spring, in a futile effort to arrange peace.¹³ With the failure of negotiations and the expiration of another truce, this time for about five months, the war was resumed in April, 1357. It went badly for the Venetians, who marshaled their resources and stopped their annual contribution of 3,000 florins for the defense of Smyrna,¹⁴ although on

¹¹ Pierre Thomas arrived in Venice on 20 September, 1356 (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Collegio, Lettere segrete [1354–1363], no. 69, fol. 21^r, a letter of the Doge Giovanni Dolfin to Pope Innocent VI, dated 16 November, 1356, publ. in Sime Ljubić, *Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga slavenstva i mletačke republike*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, V [Zagreb, 1875], no. LVI, pp. 301–2). On 23 September the Collegio agreed, with one negative vote, to accept his mediation in the dispute with Louis of Hungary. The next day the Collegio voted to make him gifts to the value of 100 ducats and, later on, to present him with 3,000 ducats *si negotium pacis duxerit ad effectum*, the same inducement as had been offered to Bongiovanni, bishop of Fermo (1349–1363), who had also been trying to make peace between Louis and the Venetians (Lett. segr. del Collegio, *ibid.*, nos. 57–58, fol. 15^r; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, V, no. XLVIII, p. 293).

It was proposed that final adjudication of the issues at stake should be left to Innocent VI (Lett. segr. del Collegio, *ibid.*, no. 59, fols. 15^r–16^r; Ljubić, in *MHSM*, V, no. XLIX, pp. 293–95; Georgius [György] Fejer, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, 11 tomes, Buda, 1829–44, tom. IX, vol. 2 [1833], nos. CCXLIII–CCXLIV, pp. 503–5, where the references to *Petrus, episcopus Portuensis* are a misreading of the texts for *Pactensis*). Papal letters pertinent to Pierre Thomas's mission to Hungary and Venice may be found in Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, VIII (1932), 130 ff.; Ljubić, *MHSM*, III (1872), nos. CCCCLXXXIX, CCCXCIV, pp. 327–28, 329–30; and Fejer, *Codex*, IX-2, nos. CCXLII, CCXLV, pp. 502–3, 505–6.

In his letter of 16 November to the pope, referred to above, the doge had stated that both the king of Hungary and the Venetian government regarded Pierre Thomas's continued efforts as indispensable to the formulation of mutually acceptable peace terms although Pierre was already gravely concerned about the delay in his mission to Constantinople. But the Venetians found negotiations with the Hungarians extremely difficult (see the account in Ljubić, *MHSM*, III, 361–68, which has also been published by Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta externa*, II [Budapest, 1875], 490–501). When the spring came it was clear there was going to be no peace, and on 28 March (1357), at the behest of the doge, his councillors, and the heads of the Quarantia, the Senate allowed Pierre, "who has labored much in our service, to arm here [in Venice] a ship with sixty oars . . . to go to Constantinople in the service of the Church and the lord pope . . ." (Misti, Reg. 27, fol. 115^r, publ. in Smet's edition of Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 201, note 26). Pierre's oarsmen and crew were to consist solely of non-Venetians although he might employ three Venetians to command and navigate the ship. He must have sailed from Venice about the middle of April.

¹⁴ R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, II (Venice, 1878), bk. v, no. 241, p. 264, a letter of Innocent VI to the doge, dated 20 June, 1357. On 15 July, 1357, the Doge Giovanni

¹¹ Reg. Aven. 133, fol. 246, "datum apud Villamnovam Avinionensis dyocesis II Idus Iulii anno quarto."

¹² Reg. Aven. 238, fol. 142, "datum apud Villamnovam . . . XVI Kal. Augusti anno quarto;" Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, pp. 54, 57, and *pièces justificatives*, no. 1, pp. 358–59.

2 August the Collegio voted to write the captain of the Gulf to "send two of the galleys of Crete with the galleys of Romania for service in the league against the Turks."¹⁵ Yielding at last to Hungarian pressure, the Venetians gave up their claims to Nona, Zara, Scardona, Sebenico, Traù, Spalato, and Ragusa in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Zara (of 18 February, 1358)¹⁶ and decades were to pass before the Venetians could re-establish their position along the eastern shore of the Adriatic.

In any event Pierre Thomas probably reached the Bosphorus toward the end of May, 1357, and he remained in the area of Constantinople for several months, waiting upon John V in his army encampment against the Turks and discussing the union of the Churches with the emperor and with various Byzantine intellectuals in the imperial palace. On 7 November, as Pierre was getting ready to return to Avignon, John answered Innocent VI's letter of 21 July of the preceding year, acknowledging that (when Pierre first arrived) he had been in no position to make a public declaration of his faith, for he was beset by too many difficulties. Now, however, he had done so:

Know, then, most holy father, that we have labored and are still laboring with all the care and forethought of which we are capable to unite our Church to the Holy Roman Church. With the advice and counsel of our nobles we have made our response to the said friar, the lord Pierre [Thomas], that, just as we promised, we are anxious to be obedient, faithful, and devoted to the Roman Church . . . , and I firmly pledge to hold in their entirety all the tenets of the Holy Roman Church, and in that faith I wish to live

Dolfin addressed the municipal authorities of Spalato and Traù, vainly seeking to recall them to their loyalty to Venice (Fejer, *Codex IX-2*, no. CCCXX, pp. 647-49).

¹⁵ *Lettere segrete del Collegio (1354-1363)*, no. 97, fol. 29^v: "Capta: Quod scribatur capitaneo nostro Culfii . . . quod . . . mittat duas de galeis Crete cum ipsis galeis Romanie pro serviciis unionis contra Turchos. . . ."

¹⁶ The relations between Louis of Hungary and the Venetian government, together with the negotiations for peace, may be followed from July, 1356, to February, 1358, in the *Lettere segrete del Collegio (1354-1363)*, nos. 20-126, fols. 8^v-40^v, which are incompletely and somewhat carelessly published by Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, V, nos. XXIII-XCVII, pp. 279-336. See Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. v, nos. 135, 137, 175, 182, 212, 264, 270, 274; Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 70-74, 197-201; H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920, repr. 1964), 215-18, 606; Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 107-28. The text of the treaty of Zara, which freed Ragusa from Venetian domination, may be found with attendant documents in Ljubić, *MHSM*, III, nos. DXLI-DXLIV, pp. 368-75 and ff., and in Fejer, *Codex IX-2* nos. CCCXXIV-CCCXXV, pp. 654-64. The doge gave up to the

and die. At no time shall I depart from it, and thus have I promised the said friar, the lord Pierre. In his hands I have sworn it in the presence of many bishops, and henceforth I shall keep the faith and fidelity to my lord, the supreme pontiff, as do the other princes in the Roman Church. Now, however, I cannot make the whole populace obey, because not all are faithful to me and submissive, and many are even lying in wait for a chance to proceed against me. But I will fulfill my obligation, and I will stand firm with you if you send the aid I asked for, and there will be no one to oppose us. I know that if your legate comes with galleys and the aid I seek, all will submit and be loyal to you. . . .

John recalled that the first Palaeologian emperor, Michael VIII, had imposed union with Rome upon the Byzantine Church, and had remained in obedience to and in communion with Rome until the day he died, "and I shall do so too with God's help." Since Pierre had brought him the papal blessing John had enjoyed some signal successes over his enemies, as he wrote Innocent, "and we believe that it has all happened because of your blessing, of which we entertain high hopes." He was still willing to send his second son Manuel as a hostage to Avignon [as he had offered to do in his chrysobull of 15 December, 1355], but Pierre had regarded it as inexpedient to do so at this time. Indeed, John stated that he wished himself to go to Avignon to show the pope the reverence he knew to be his due. There were of course limits to what one could say in a letter, but John had directed Pierre to report more fully when he returned to Avignon. "But do not be concerned about the patriarch [the anti-Latin Callistus], for I shall depose him and put in his place another whom I know to be loyal to the Holy Roman Church. . . . I commend myself and my empire to your Holiness. . . ." ¹⁷

king of Hungary the ducal titles of Dalmatia and Croatia (Fejer, *ibid.*, pp. 656-57).

¹⁷ This chrysobull (*et aurea bulla est appensa*) is known only because Philippe de Mézières included it in his *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 76-79. It appears to be authentic, and Pierre may have given Mézières the text, which is written in the conversational Latin of the time. Since it purports to be a χρυσόβουλλον, the original was presumably in Greek (cf. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 61, note 2), and improperly refers to Pierre as a legate. As noted by Halecki and Smet, this text is not to be found in Reg. Vat. 62, a collection of letters and other documents illustrating papal relations with the East (which I have used earlier in this volume, and which is described in Jules Gay, *Le Pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient [1342-1352]*, Paris, 1904, pp. 8-10). Cf. Halecki, *op cit.*, pp. 62-63, 67-68, and Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 147-50.

John V was only about nine years old when his father

From the shores of the Bosphorus Pierre Thomas sailed to the island kingdom of Cyprus. When Hugh IV heard of his arrival, he is said to have gone out to meet him to lead him into Nicosia with such honors as would have sufficed for a greater prelate than Pierre had yet become at this period in his career. After a period of illness in Cyprus, Pierre went on the perilous pilgrimage to Palestine, where he visited the Holy Sepulcher and other sacred places, celebrated mass at the Sepulcher, and preached to an assembly of Christians on Mount Zion despite the comings and goings of Moslems, who "murmured" at his audacity. Thereafter he returned to Cyprus, whence after a stay at the Carmelite house within the northwest walls of Famagusta he set out on the long journey back to Avignon, probably in the fall of 1358, to report on his Greek mission to Innocent and the Curia and doubtless to tell them the extraordinary tale of his pilgrimage to the scenes of Christ's life and death.¹⁸

The annual subventions, for the defense of Smyrna, of 3,000 gold florins a year were apparently being paid with some regularity by the Holy See, Cyprus, the Hospital, and Venice.¹⁹ On 1 April, 1353, Innocent had written, urging King Hugh IV of Cyprus to render appropriate assistance to the Byzantine Emperor John VI Cantacuzenus in his apparent intention to effect the much-desired union of the

Churches.²⁰ (This was of course about twenty months before John VI's fall from power). Although such union would be an obvious boon to the Curia's anti-Turkish policy, it lay quite beyond the realm of achievement, and Cantacuzenus's sincerity was at least suspect. But the Latins held fast to Smyrna, and on 28 November (1353) Innocent warned King Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia and the government of Genoa to allow free and undisturbed passage to two ships, loaded with provisions, which were being sent to hard-pressed Smyrna at the expense of the Holy See, Cyprus, the Hospital, and Venice.²¹ About a year and a half later we find Innocent trying to bring pressure to bear upon the Emperor Charles IV to contribute to the defense of Smyrna.²²

On 11 June, 1355, Innocent VI wrote King Hugh IV of Cyprus and Pierre de Corneillan, the new master of the Hospital, that as much effort must be given to maintaining the Christian hold on Smyrna as the Turks were expending to seize the city. The defenders of Smyrna were always hard pressed for supplies. Innocent urged the master and the king quickly to send their annual contributions for the relief of the city. A similar letter was sent to Venice, where only two months before the aged Doge Marino Falier had been executed for treason (on 17 April). Innocent also stated that Bishop Odo of Paphos in Cyprus had been instructed to send the papacy's annual allotment of 3,000 florins to Pierre de Corneillan, who was to send the money to Smyrna along with the Hospitallers' own contribution.²³ Hugh IV replied that he was prepared either to send the 3,000 florins according to the four-power agreement (of the Church and Cyprus, the Hospital and Venice) or

Andronicus III died in June, 1341, and thereafter he was much under the influence of his Catholic mother, Anna of Savoy, who in one way or another had long been interested in the union of the Churches (M. Viller, "La Question de l'union des églises entre Grecs et Latins . . .," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XVIII [1922], 40 ff.). Note the sad reflections of Mézières, written more than thirty years later, on the futile outcome of John's being "reconciled to the Church of Rome," in G. W. Coopland, ed., *Le Songe du vieil pèlerin*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1969, I, 258–59.

¹⁸ Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 80–82; Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibliografica*, V (1927), 77–80.

¹⁹ Gasnault and Laurent, I, fasc. 1 (1959), no. 80, p. 28, dated 24 January, 1353, referring to the Cypriote contribution; see also, *ibid.*, nos. 86, 92–93, 94; vol. I, fasc. 2 (1960), nos. 618–21, 642, 646, 689, 693; vol. II, fasc. 3 (1962), nos. 735, 1133, 1138, 1156, *et alibi*; and vol. III, fasc. 4 (1968), nos. 1630–32, 1788, all relating to financial or military assistance to Smyrna. As we shall see later on, however, the Venetians claimed never to have promised annual contributions of 3,000 florins (or in their case, ducats), and declared that they had made only one such payment (when Raymond Saquet was papal legate in the East). Legacies were collected and tithes were levied for the defense of Latin Christians against the Turks (*ibid.*, I, fasc. 2, nos. 643–47, and vol. II, fasc. 3, nos. 781–82).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, fasc. 1, no. 215, pp. 72–73; note also vol. I, fasc. 2, no. 610, pp. 202–3, a papal letter to Cantacuzenus, dated 27 October, 1353, and *cf.* nos. 694–95.

²¹ *Ibid.*, I, fasc. 2, no. 642, p. 215; George Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (Cambridge, 1948), 301.

²² Gasnault, III, fasc. 4, no. 1494, p. 86, dated 7 May, 1355, letters to Nicholas of Luxemburg, patriarch of Aquileia; John Ocko, bishop of Olmütz in Moravia; Arnestus de Pardubiz, archbishop of Prague; Marquardt (Marchardus) de Randeck, bishop of Augsburg; and Giovanni II, marquis of Montferrat. They were all to exhort Charles IV "ad succurrendum civitatem Smirnarum."

²³ Gasnault, III, fasc. 4, nos. 1630–32, pp. 124–25. Dieudonné de Gozon, master of the Hospitallers, had died in December, 1353, and, as his successor, the Rhodian Convent had elected Pierre de Corneillan, to whom Innocent VI sent his congratulations on 27 March, 1354 (*ibid.*, II, fasc. 3, no. 848, p. 57, and *cf.* nos. 849–50, 857, 864–65, etc.).

to maintain two Cypriote galleys each year as his contribution. Innocent VI replied on 26 October (1355) that he was writing to ask the master of the Hospital, as Hugh had apparently suggested, which of the alternatives would be the more useful for the protection of Smyrna against Turkish attacks.²⁴

Since the dissolution of the Temple more than forty years before, the Hospitallers had been at the center of crusading activity in the Levant. It was well to ask the advice of Pierre de Corneillan as master of the Hospital, but doing so did not signify much confidence in the Order, which had many severe critics at the Curia. In fact Innocent VI wrote Pierre a scorching letter on 14 October, 1355, reminding him that, when some months earlier Juan Fernández de Heredia, castellan of Amposta and prior of Castile and León, and two preceptors of the Hospital were leaving for Rhodes, he had stressed the bitterness which he (and of course the Curia) felt at the Hospitallers' "pernicious negligence and intolerable idleness."

The pope and the cardinals were well aware (according to the letter) that the Hospitallers had long failed to meet the noble requirements of the *Christi militia*, which had rendered them pleasing to God in the old days when they had done their duty against enemies of the faith. Now they were wallowing in pleasures which modesty forbade the pope to describe. Heredia, whom the pope praised as zealous for the "good state" of the Hospital, and the two preceptors had conveyed to Rhodes the papal injunction for the complete reform of the Order. Innocent's immediate predecessors (as he reminded Corneillan)—John XXII, Benedict XII, and Clement VI—had all admonished the Hospitallers to exert their *vires et virtutes* against the "abominable perfidy of the Turks" by invading the lands over which they tyrannized, to the shame and peril of Christendom. The Hospitallers were to transfer their convent to Turkish territory and to maintain it there. Resources had been showered upon them, "not to rust in Rhodes," but to use against the Turks. Eastern Christians were clamoring for help. Europeans were excoriating the Hospitallers' fruitless inactivity. If they did not transfer the entire convent from Rhodes to Asia Minor (*in Turchiam*), Innocent warned them that he intended to found a new military order and endow it with the property which the Hospitallers had received from the spoliation of the Templars.

²⁴ Gasnault, III, fasc. 4, nos. 1788, 1791, pp. 203, 205.

The Hospitallers, then, must reconquer in "Turchia" the lands which Turkish impiety had seized and still held.²⁵

At length Heredia had returned to Avignon with the news that Pierre de Corneillan had received the pope's commands with all humility and devotion, but he could not take such a step (as the transfer of the convent to "Turkey") without the aid and counsel of the priors and knights of the Order. He had therefore directed that a "general congregation" be convened of the Hospitallers in Europe, which Innocent now decreed should be held in Nîmes or in Montpellier at the beginning of January, 1356. Warning Corneillan that certain irresponsible Hospitallers at Rhodes were intimating that the pope had actually not charged Heredia to deliver a mandate to reform the Order and to relocate the convent, Innocent repeated his stern injunctions with adequate moral exhortations.²⁶

Although Innocent's efforts to maintain the maritime league against the Turks met with only slight success, his efforts were as sincere as they were persistent. He was deeply moved by the tales of Turkish attacks which reached Avignon. On 1 April, 1356, he wrote Giovanni Gradenigo, then the doge of Venice, that while the Venetians and Genoese were at war, "the Turks renewed their audacity, and ranging with hostile intent through the sea, they have inflicted deplorable hardships and abundant losses upon the faithful, and they still continue to do so." Innocent insisted that [three] Venetian galleys (in accordance with the pact of 11 August, 1350, which had renewed the league for ten years) should join [two] Cypriote and [three] Hospitaller galleys in the port of Smyrna on or before the coming 1 July. He also demanded the dispatch to Avignon of Venetian envoys by 1 November, *cum pleno ac sufficienti mandato*, to reaffirm or modify the provisions of the league in consultation with the envoys whom he was summoning from Cyprus and the Hospital.²⁷

²⁵ Gasnault, III, fasc. 4, no. 1773, pp. 193–94; Sebastiano Pauli, ed., *Codice diplomatico del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano, oggi di Malta*, 2 vols., Lucca, 1733–37, II, no. LXXIII, pp. 91–93. Although the name of the castellan of Amposta (and later master of the Hospital) is commonly shortened to Heredia, it should perhaps be properly given as Fernández de Heredia.

²⁶ Gasnault, III, fasc. 4, no. 1773, pp. 194–95. The Curia's dissatisfaction with the Hospitallers continued under Innocent's successor Urban V (cf. Paul Lecacheux, ed., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V [1362–1370] se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 1 [1902], nos. 573–81, p. 78, and cf. nos. 600 ff.).

²⁷ G. M. Thomas and R. Predelli, eds., *Diplomatarium*

At Avignon in March, 1357, a commission of five cardinals met with the envoys of Cyprus, the Hospital, and Venice, and on the twentieth of the month the envoys agreed to try to persuade their principals to renew the Clementine league against the Turks for five years. The Cypriotes, Hospitallers, and Venetians were each to maintain two armed galleys in eastern waters, certainly a modest flotilla, but the *sex galee armate* were to be in continual service, under the command of a papal legate, a captain-general, and a council of galley commanders. The six galleys were to assemble at Smyrna on the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin (8 September). But if the Hospital provided a third galley, Venice should do so also, which would increase the fleet to eight galleys, as provided for in the pact of 1350. Nothing was put in writing concerning an annual subsidy of 3,000 florins from any of the contracting parties for the defense of Smyrna, at least not in this document. The various articles of the tentative agreement were to be approved by the pope, who would then write to Hugh IV of Cyprus, Roger des Pins, the new master of the Hospital, and Giovanni Dolfín, the new doge of Venice.²⁸

Considering Innocent's attitude toward the Hospitallers, one might suppose that he would demand the third galley of them, but when the league was later formed, each of the participants contributed two galleys. Actually rather little would come of all this planning, although during Innocent's time a leader would emerge to launch at least one important attack upon the Ottoman Turks (at Lampsacus). The Avignonese registers for Innocent's reign make clear the large extent of his efforts on behalf of the crusade. But the capture of Smyrna had taken place before he became pope; the sack of Alexandria would come

after his death; in the meantime he found in Europe all the problems he could handle.

Putting an end to the costly war between France and England and to the Venetian conflicts with Genoa and Hungary was not the only requirement for an offensive against the Turks; the restoration of papal authority over the states of the Church in Italy had also to be achieved before the Camera Apostolica could make large financial commitments to the crusade. Shortly after his accession Innocent VI had named the formidable Gil de Albornoz, cardinal-priest of S. Clemente, to the Italian legation (on 30 June, 1353). Albornoz was to go into northern Italy *tanquam pacis angelus*, and to re-establish papal supremacy in the March of Ancona, the Massa Trabaria, the district of Urbino, the Romagna, the duchy of Spoleto, Sabina, the Patrimony of S. Peter in Tuscany, Campania, the Marittima, "and the other adjacent areas and lands subject directly and indirectly to the Church."²⁹ Although the Visconti of Milan were the strongest opponents of the papacy, the Ordelaffi of Forlì and the Manfredi of Faenza were also its bitter enemies. Innocent ordered the "crusade" to be preached against them.³⁰ Albornoz's accomplishment of his mission (1353–1357, 1358–1363), despite the vacillation of the pope and the vagaries of curial politics, forms one of the more remarkable chapters in the eventful history of the fourteenth century.

Innocent VI had other problems which devoured his declining funds and diverted him from eastern affairs. After the English victory in the three-day "battle of Poitiers," fought near Maupertuis (on 17–19 September, 1356), and the capture of King John II of France, a two years' truce was negotiated at Bordeaux and concluded under papal auspices on 23 March, 1357.³¹ It immediately led to the dismissal of mercenaries who, organized in "free companies," turned to plunder as their chief means of livelihood. Repeated bulls of excommunication *ad reprimendas insolentias* failed to lessen the brigands' enthusiasm for murder, rape, robbery, and extortion.³² Although they were known as "li Engles," there were few English among them, at least in the south of France.

veneto-levantinum (1300–1454), II (Venice, 1899, repr. 1965), no. 16, pp. 26–28; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. v, no. 153, p. 246; and for the pact of August, 1350, see *ibid.*, II, bk. iv, no. 352, p. 184, and above; N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières (1327–1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1896, p. 100.

²⁸ Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II, no. 19, pp. 35–37; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. v, no. 225, p. 261, and *cf.* no. 228, p. 262. On 8 October, 1357, John V Palaeologus confirmed and extended for five years the previous "truce" (of 1349), *ἡ τελευταία τρέβα*, with the Venetians (Franz Miklosich and Jos. Müller, *Acta et diplomata res graecas italicque illustrantia*, III [Vienna, 1865, repr. Aalen, 1968], docs. xxvii, xxix, pp. 114–26), which two years later would make Pierre Thomas's efforts to assist John against the Turks much easier, for Pierre was to use the galleys of the league in a bold attack upon the Turkish stronghold of Lampsacus, on which see below.

²⁹ Gasnault and Laurent, I, fasc. 2, nos. 352–432, pp. 123–35.

³⁰ *Cf.* Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II, bk. v, nos. 72, 109, 129, 156, 207, 216, pp. 228 ff.

³¹ H. Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la désolation des églises . . .*, II (Paris, 1899, repr. Brussels, 1965), 146–47.

³² Denifle, II, 179–88.

In May, 1357, panic gripped Avignon as the Gascon commander Arnaud de Cervole, arch-priest of Vélaines (in the diocese of Périgueux), got ready to enter the county of Provence, which belonged of course to Queen Joanna of Naples and her husband Louis of Taranto. For months Arnaud's *routiers* pillaged the rich county to the shores of the Mediterranean, nor did they spare the papal Comtat-Venaissin. They laid siege to Aix-en-Provence, and the Aixois (like the citizens of Marseille) destroyed their own suburbs to prevent Arnaud's men from securing lodgment in the convents, villas, and other buildings outside the city walls. Having exhausted the Provençal countryside, Arnaud withdrew into France in the spring of 1358; in July he was in the dauphin's company, prepared for service against Étienne Marcel and the still embattled burghers of Paris. After Marcel's death Arnaud returned to Provence to collect a ransom from the Provençaux, on whose behalf Innocent arranged for the payment of 1,000 gold florins. Arnaud then departed (in September) for the Nivernais where, as a royal lieutenant for a year, he abused the citizens of Nevers in outrageous fashion, and lost his commission. *Semel barbarus, semper barbarus*, but all the same Arnaud ended up by marrying one of the richest heiresses in Burgundy.³³

Arnaud might have made a good crusader, and (ironically enough) Amadeo VI, the Green Count of Savoy, was to enroll him and his mercenaries for service in the Balkan crusade of 1366–1367. Arnaud was killed, however, by one of his own followers in the area between Lyon and Mâcon (on 25 May, 1366), as he was on his way to join Amadeo, who received the news at Venice while he awaited him. The loss of Arnaud and his mercenaries was a blow to Amadeo, and may have limited the scope of the Savoyard crusade. But it was probably unrealistic, as Denifle has suggested, to try to enlist these gangs of ruffians for an expedition overseas. There was no discipline among them, and they had "less faith than the Turks."³⁴

³³ Denifle, II, 186, 188–211, 251–52; Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 321–22, 336, 337, and vol. II, pp. 461–63; and cf. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (1949), pp. 104–5.

³⁴ Denifle, II, 478–86, 490–91; R. Delachenal, ed., *Chronique des règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*, 4 vols., Paris, 1910–20, II (1916), 18–19; and cf. Eugene L. Cox, *The Green Count of Savoy: Amadeus VI and Transalpine Savoy in the Fourteenth Century*, Princeton, 1967, pp. 188, 202–3, 205–8, 210. Urban V once proposed to Bernabò Visconti, the lord

Arnaud de Cervole's plundering of Provence in 1357–1358 had caused Innocent VI to begin the great fortifications of Avignon, which were sorely needed, for after the futile efforts to make peace between France and England in the two treaties of London (in January, 1358, and March, 1359), the Dauphin Charles and the Black Prince reached an agreement at Brétigny in the region of Beauce on 8 May, 1360. This agreement was ratified the following October in a royal ceremony at Calais. Peace was proclaimed, and more mercenaries were thrown out of work. On the night of 28–29 December, 1360, a large troop of such freebooters called the Grand Company (*Magna Societas*) seized the town of Pont S. Esprit in the diocese of Uzès, on the Rhone just north of Orange and Avignon. This was a most serious matter, because (as Innocent VI reminded all the townsmen of southern France) Pont S. Esprit was the point "through which goods and most foodstuffs necessary and useful to the Curia are brought down [to Avignon]."³⁵

In a letter of 8 January, 1361, to the archbishop of Narbonne and his suffragans, Innocent declared a crusade against the miscreants who had occupied Pont S. Esprit, promising the crusaders the same indulgences as those accorded crusaders in the Holy Land.³⁶ Money was raised to gird the papal city with new walls,³⁷ and

of Milan, that one should negotiate with the free companies in Italy "ut pergant ad passagium generale cisque detur subsidium per omnes Italicos:" it would be worth paying the expenses of sending the free companies off on a crusade to get them out of Italy (Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 2 [Paris, 1906], no. 1037, p. 161, dated 25 June, 1364). This was all very well, but apparently few *routiers* could be induced to go overseas.

³⁵ See the register of letters, patent and close, compiled by the Florentine humanist and papal secretary Zanobi della Strada for the ninth year of Innocent VI (1361) in E. Martène and U. Durand, eds., *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, II (Paris, 1717, repr. New York, 1968), *epp.* XII–XIV, cols. 851–55, dated 17 January, 1361, to King John II of France, Duke Charles of Normandy (the "dauphin"), and the citizenry of southern France, and see also *epp.* XIX–XXII, XXVI–XXVIII, XXXII–XXXIII, XXXV, XXXIX, LXXII, CIX–CX. Pont S. Esprit was taken "per nonnullas gentes nefarias, quae se Magnam Societatem appellant" (*ep.* LXXII, col. 910B); on the name "Grand Company," note Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans*, II, 209, 380, 390, and on the whole affair, *ibid.*, II, 378–79, 385–98.

³⁶ Denifle, II, 395; Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 323, 340, and vol. II, pp. 463–64.

³⁷ Martène and Durand, II, *epp.* XXIX, CCXXVI–CCXXVII, cols. 869, 1049–51, and cf. Denifle, II, 198, 386. On outlays by the Camera Apostolica for the defense of Avignon and the Comtat-Venaissin during 1357–1358, see Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens*

Juan Fernández de Heredia, on whom Innocent chiefly relied, was made governor of the Comtat-Venaissin (on 9 May).³⁸ About the end of March (1361), however, most of the invaders were bought off for the considerable sum of 14,500 gold florins. They went into Italy, presumably over the picturesque Mont Genève Pass, to serve with the Marquis Giovanni of Montferrat against the Milanese.³⁹ The Avignonese could breathe more easily for a while, and so could Innocent VI.

Pierre Thomas's experience of conditions in the eastern Mediterranean had made him an ardent advocate of the crusade, and after his return to the Curia Innocent VI promptly saw in him a means of defending Smyrna against the Anatolian emirs and of advancing the Christian cause in the Levant. On 10 May, 1359, he transferred Pierre from the bishopric of Patti to the Moreote see of Coron,⁴⁰ and on the following day, by the bull *Angit nos*, he made him apostolic legate in the East where, he declared, the "monstrous fury" of the Turks kept the Christians under constant assault, especially in Greece and in the city of Smyrna. The bull defined Pierre's jurisdiction as including the kingdom of Cyprus, the archbishoprics of Crete, Smyrna, Patras, Athens, Thebes, Corinth, Rhodes, Naxos, Corfu, Durazzo, Lepanto, Neopatra, and (since John Palaeologus had made his obeisance to the Holy See) the patriarchate of Constantinople. Pierre was given full authority to deal with kings, princes, and other persons,

ecclesiastical and secular, to compose and confirm leagues and alliances, and to make peace and enforce it by ecclesiastical censures,⁴¹ and of course the Latin hierarchy and clergy and the lay lords and officials in the Levant were duly notified of his appointment.⁴²

On the same day (11 May, 1359) Pierre, the Latin archbishops under his new legatine jurisdiction (and their suffragans), the archbishop of Genoa, and the bishop of Castello (Venice) were again addressed in letters containing further denunciation of the Turks, who invaded Christian lands unceasingly, including the provinces of the patriarchate of Constantinople, put Christians to the sword, sold them like *animalia bruta* into an intolerable servitude, and made them abjure the faith and trample under foot the cross, the symbol of man's redemption. The Latin hierarchy in the Levant, together with the archbishop of Genoa and his grace of Castello, received authority to preach the crusade and to grant the usual indulgences to all who took the cross with due devotion.⁴³ Among the numerous faculties accorded Pierre as he prepared for his eastern mission was that of subjecting to ecclesiastical censure those Christian miscreants who traded with the Ottoman and emirate Turks, and even made alliances with them, to the injury of their fellow Christians and in offense to divine majesty.⁴⁴ From the

VI. und Innocenz VI. (1914), pp. 681–82, 726–28, and during 1360–1362, *ibid.*, pp. 750–52, 792, 821–22.

³⁸ Martène and Durand, II, *opp.* VII, XLVII, CXXVII, CLXIV–CLXV, cols. 847–48, 883, 954–55, 995–97; C. Devic and J. Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, 16 vols., Toulouse, 1872–1905, IX, 722–24, with the notes added by A. Molinier (in 10 vols., Toulouse, 1840–46, VII, 225–26); Denifle, II, 260–62, 397, 398; Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1902), no. 596, p. 80, dated 4 September, 1363; and see in general Anthony Luttrell, "Juan Fernández de Heredia at Avignon, 1351–1367," in *Studia Albortiana*, XI (1972), 289–316.

³⁹ Denifle, II, 398, and cf. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, pp. 105–6, and Luttrell, in *Studia Albortiana*, XI, 301.

⁴⁰ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 97^v–98^r; Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 28; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, VIII (1932), 162; Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 99, 212; Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet (1954), pp. 84, 207, who provides in his notes and appendices the basic archival references for Pierre Thomas's career. The see of Coron became vacant when Innocent VI transferred the incumbent, Lodovico Torriani, to the patriarchate of Aquileia.

⁴¹ Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 54^r–55^r; Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 2; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1359, no. 16, vol. VII (XXVI, Lucca, 1752), pp. 44–45.

⁴² Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 55^r–56^r; Reg. Vat. 234, fols. 2^v–3^v. Pierre was entitled to procurations of six florins a day, safe conduct (i.e. safe passage), and transportation from ecclesiastics through whose lands and jurisdictions his mission was to carry him, "eundo ad partes legationis predicte, vel redeundo de illis, diebus singulis in sex florenis auri pro expensis suis necessariis et de securo conductu necnon de evocationibus oportunis" (Reg. Aven. 141, fols. 17^r–18^r, and cf. fols. 20^v–21^r). The galley commanders overseas were admonished according to the usual formula "to deal with him honorably" (*ibid.*, fol. 23^v).

Legates and nuncios sometimes had difficulty collecting the living allowances to which they were entitled by their letters of legation. Pierre seems to have had a fairly large suite, including a *tabellionatus officium* of seven unmarried notaries (Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 17). On 10 July, 1364, Urban V was going to grant Pierre the faculty of taking appropriate action against ecclesiastics (and certain laymen) who had declined or failed to pay the procurations authorized by Innocent VI for the duration of Pierre's present legation [1359–1362] (Reg. Vat. 251, fol. 315).

⁴³ Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 62^v–63^r; Reg. Vat. 234, fols. 7^r–8^r.

⁴⁴ Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 22, dated 12 May, 1359: "Et sicut displicenter accepimus, non nulli fideles de partibus ipsis et

time of the first crusades there had been Moslem and Christian traders in the Levant who had got along with one another quite as well as, and sometimes better than, with their coreligionists.

Since Innocent apparently regarded John V as having embraced Catholicism at Pierre Thomas's hands (when the latter was bishop of Patti), Pierre was now to render him every assistance he could for the defense of his shrunken realm and for the recovery of his rights and lands "contra Turchos et alios infideles. . . ."⁴⁵ The problems caused by John's "conversion" in 1357 have been reconsidered in recent years, and we shall not add to these discussions, but subsequent events were to show that the crusade being organized in 1359 was intended not only to defend Smyrna against the Anatolian emirs but also to assist Constantinople against the terrifying increase of Ottoman power. John V's appeal to the papacy for aid in 1355 and the obeisance he made to Catholicism two years later were not to prove wholly unavailing.

The continuance of Latin domination in Smyrna for some fifteen years already seemed to contemporaries a remarkable achievement, and perhaps it was, but it was also evidence that the emirates were declining. Since 1356 Orso Dolfín, archbishop of Crete and member of a distinguished Venetian family, had been serving as vicar and captain of Smyrna as well as papal

legate in the East.⁴⁶ Pierre Thomas was replacing him as legate, and Innocent VI now appointed the hardy Florentine Hospitaller, Niccolò Benedetti, preceptor of the Order at Venosa, to take over Dolfín's duties as papal vicar and captain in Smyrna.⁴⁷ In Benedetti's commission Innocent stressed the Curia's continuing anxiety for the safety of Smyrna. Benedetti was to hold the vicariate and captaincy for eight years, during which time he was to take measures *de muranda et turribus munienda [civitate]*, and maintain at his command 150 Latin mercenaries and two galleys. In one way or another Innocent was obviously going to arrange payment for the galleys, which were to fly the papal banner with the crossed keys.⁴⁸

Niccolò Benedetti was instructed to gird Smyrna with heavy, well-constructed walls within the first seven years of his tenure, and he might help defray the expenses of his office by sending as often as he wished one ship and two galleys, loaded with merchandise but excluding iron, wood, and other naval contraband, to Alexandria or any other territory belonging to the soldan of Egypt.⁴⁹ To help build the new forti-

etiam aliunde vitio avaritiae et cupiditatis inducti ad partes seu terras et loca Turchorum infidelium . . . cum mercimoniis et sine mercimoniis accedere et cum eis mercari seu negotiari et, quod prae dolor deterius et nephandius est, cum eis confederationes et ligas contrahere et inire ipsisque in pluribus auxilia et favores prestare . . . temere presumpserunt hactenus et presumunt. . . ."

⁴⁵ Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 20^v, dated 11 May, 1359, and cf. *ibid.*, fol. 21^v, with reference to "carissimus in Christo filius noster Johannes Romeorum imperator et moderator illustris," the use of the phrase indicating that, in the pope's eyes at least, John V had accepted Latin Catholicism at Pierre's hands, on which note Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 75, 204, 207–8, and cf. M. Viller, "La Question de l'union des églises," *Rev. d'hist. ecclésiastique*, XVIII (1922), 57–58, and Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas* (1966), pp. 149–50, as opposed to the opinion of Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (1930), p. 62, who regards the ceremony of 1357 as a gesture of John's "bonne volonté individuelle" and of "son obéissance à l'égard de l'Église catholique" rather than as an act of full conversion to Catholicism, which did not come until 1369 (*ibid.*, pp. 188 ff.). Mézières, *ed. cit.*, p. 75, had no doubt that "ipse imperator factus est verus Catholicus," but it is possible that the ceremony of 1357 meant something different to John from what it did to Pierre Thomas, whose view was of course that adopted by the Curia Romana.

⁴⁶ On 30 June, 1358, Innocent VI directed Orso to see to the collection of the annual subvention of 3,000 florins *pro custodia civitatis Smirnarum* from Hugh IV of Cyprus, the master of the Hospital, and the doge of Venice (Pauli, *Codice diplomatico*, II [1737], no. LXXIV, pp. 93–94).

⁴⁷ Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 63^v–64^r; Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 8^v, dated 11 May, 1359.

⁴⁸ Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 60; Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 6, dated 11 May, 1359: "Dilecto filio Nicolao Benedicti preceptoris domus Venusine Hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerusalemiani vicario et capitaneo civitatis Smirnarum pro nobis et Romana Ecclesia salutem, etc. Super universum gregem dominicum pastores quamquam immeriti disponente domino constituti curis assiduis angimur et continua pulsamur instantia ut fideles Christicolae ab infidelium tueamur insultibus. . . . Auxilia et remedia multa pro defensione fidelium et exaltatione fidei ac repressione infidelium predictorum duximus adhibenda . . . , ac nostro et ipsarum ecclesie et fidei nomine custodiendam fideliter dictam civitatem Smirnarum ac de centum et quinquaginta bonis et sufficientibus stipendiariis latinis ad ipsius civitatis et de duabus galeis sub nostris etiam et ipsius ecclesie nomine et vexillo ad earundem civitatis et parcium custodiam continue tenendis per octo annos proxime futuros . . . te nostrum in ipsa civitate vicarium ac ipsius civitatis necnon dictarum duarum galearum capitaneum usque ad dictos octo annos, amoto exinde quolibet alio vicario seu capitaneo etiam per nos et sedem predictam ibidem hactenus deputato [i.e. Orso Dolfín], auctoritate apostolica de fratrum nostrorum consilio facimus, constituimus, et etiam ordinamus. . . ."

⁴⁹ Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 56; Reg. Vat. 234, fol. 3: ". . . civitatem infra primos septem annos undique bonis et grossis muris anges et super eis turres construi facies. . . . Tibi [poteris facere] duci per dictum tempus predictorum octo

fications at Smyrna as well as to help maintain the pope's two galleys, Benedetti was to receive an annual subvention of 3,000 gold florins from funds collected for the Camera by the apostolic nuncio Peter Damandi, archdeacon of Limassol, and by those who might succeed him in the nunciature during the eight years of Benedetti's vicariate at Smyrna. A papal letter of 25 May (1359) directed Damandi to pay Benedetti the sum specified, the money having been turned over to Roger des Pins, master of the Hospital, "for the custody of Smyrna," and on the same day Innocent wrote Benedetti of the instructions he had sent Damandi.⁵⁰ The high clergy and laity everywhere along the route to Smyrna were advised of Benedetti's appointment and were requested to receive him hospitably and to see that he and his suite enjoyed full security at all times.⁵¹

Among the flood of curial letters prepared by chancery clerks on 11 May (1359) two others concerning the Benedetti appointment to the Smyrniote vicariate are of particular interest. In one of them Innocent VI granted "our beloved sons Francesco Benedetti of Florence, of the brethren of the Hospital of S. John of Jerusalem, and Pace Benedetti, his brother, a citizen of Florence," that if their brother Niccolò should die within the eight-year term of his vicariate or become otherwise incapacitated, he

was to be succeeded by "you, my son Francesco, if you survive him and are available for the post, otherwise [by] you, my son Pace. . . ."⁵² The second letter provided the three (or four?) brothers with a still further inducement for strenuous service on the Anatolian coast. Realizing that Niccolò would pursue the "repression of the Turks" with all the more diligence if he could hope for some further reward, Innocent granted a Benedetti petition

that whatever fortresses, lands, and towns [*loca*] belonging to the Turks and other infidels . . . should happen to be captured and acquired by you or by our beloved sons Giovanni and Pace, citizens of Florence, and your brothers . . . , with the counsel of our brethren [the cardinals] and by the authority of the present letter we do concede and grant indulgence that, in our name and that of the Roman Church, you as long as you live, and after your death your brothers, may retain these [places], with all their rights and appurtenances, for themselves and their successors, and use on their own behalf the profits, incomes, and revenues, so long as you and your brothers and their successors recognize these [holdings] as grants from us and from the aforesaid Church.⁵³

At the same time Pope Innocent informed Hugh IV of Cyprus, a cautious crusader, Roger des Pins, the master of the Hospital, and Giovanni Dolfin, the doge of Venice, of Pierre Thomas's appointment to the eastern legation. He also described Niccolò Benedetti's responsibilities as the new vicar and captain of Smyrna. Once more, as in various other letters, the pope included the patriarchate of Constantinople along with the city of Smyrna and the "provinces of Romania" among the areas to be defended against the Turks, who were striving "with all their might for the degradation of the name of Christ and of the Catholic faith." All were to assume their share of the burden in the forthcoming crusade,⁵⁴ and a month later (on 8

annorum quotienscumque et quandocumque volueris unam navem mercimoniis oneratam, exceptis ferro et lignaminibus et aliis prohibitis, ad Alexandria et alias partes et terras ultramarinas que per soldanum Babilonie detinentur . . . , and note Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 57r: ". . . ut per tempus octo annorum predictum, quotienscumque et quandocumque sibi placuerit, possit . . . unam navem et duas galeas mercibus oneratas . . . duci et exinde reduci facere. . . ."

Niccolò Benedetti's responsibilities, including the necessity to build new walls and towers at Smyrna, are also stressed in Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 57r, and Reg. Vat. 234, fols. 3v-4r, and in Reg. Aven. 141, fols. 22v-23r, *et alibi*. In listing these responsibilities, "pro quibus faciendis," Innocent wrote, "non nulla pecuniaria et alia subsidia tibi eroganda providimus" (Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 22v, and *cf.* Reg. Aven. 140, fols. 60r, 63r), the *alia subsidia* being chiefly the concessions to trade in Mamluk territories. Innocent must have got to know Benedetti in March, 1357, when the latter represented the master of the Hospital in Avignon in connection with the renewal of the Clementine league against the Turks (Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II, no. 19, p. 35, "Nicolaus de Benedicto, preceptor Venusii").

⁵⁰ Reg. Vat. 241, fols. 63r-64r.

⁵¹ Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 18r, dated 11 May, 1359: the pope wanted "[Benedictum] ipsum suosque familiares et nuncios in eundo, morando, et redeundo plena securitate gauderi."

⁵² Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 57r, and Reg. Vat. 234, fols. 3v-4r.

⁵³ Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 23. Since Giovanni Benedetti is described merely as a *civis Florentinus* (*ibid.*), like Pace, the occurrence of his name is presumably not an error for Francesco, who is identified as a *frater Hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerusalem* (Reg. Aven. 140, fol. 57r).

⁵⁴ *Cf.* Reg. Aven. 141, fols. 23v-24r, dated 10 May, 1359. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 70, regards such references to the patriarchate of Constantinople as "of course to the Latin patriarchate," which may be the case, but Innocent's letter to Pierre Thomas of 11 May, 1359 (in Reg. Aven. 141, fol. 20), which Halecki apparently failed to note (and in which Innocent

June, 1359) the Venetian Senate voted to do so *pro honore nostro et pro salute et bono locorum nostrorum*, for the honor of the state and the safety of the Republic's overseas possessions. The Senate passed a resolution to order the duke and council of Crete to keep in service for five years the two Venetian galleys assigned to the "league against the Turks," and since nothing could be accomplished without money, according to the resolution, 2,000 ducats were to be sent to the duke, and thereafter still larger sums must be provided, "namely by the convoy [*muda*] of March and by the convoy of September, 4,000 ducats are to be sent to him by each convoy." At Pierre's request a crew of oarsmen, then in short supply in the East, and other essentials were also to be dispatched to Crete for employment on his galley.⁵⁵

The Venetians had some reason to believe they were carrying their full share of the burden. On 14 July (1359) the Senate approved allowing the legate Pierre Thomas and his companion Niccolò Benedetti the personal use of a state galley, but declined to make a further contribution of 3,000 ducats for the defense of Smyrna, claiming that they had only once given such a sum, under conditions of urgent necessity, but that they had never promised to continue such payments. They already bore too great a burden of expense.⁵⁶ We can only assume,

refers to John V Palaeologus as a Catholic), instructed Pierre to aid John against the Turks and to encourage him in continued adherence to the Latin faith. Innocent speaks of the "city of Smyrna and the provinces of Romania [which comprised the Latin patriarchate] and other lands and places . . . as well as the patriarchate of Constantinople and its provinces in which the name of the Christian religion is upheld" (*ibid.*, fol. 23^v).

⁵⁵ Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 29, fol. 7^v; Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, app. v, p. 208. On 5 August (1359) Innocent VI wrote Niccolò Acciajuoli thanking him for offering "as promptly as willingly your person and your substance . . . for the defense of Christ's name against the madness of the Turks . . . in allegiance to us and to the Roman Church. . ." (J.A.C. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, II [Paris, 1845], Florence: doc. xxii, pp. 135–36). Zanobi della Strada, papal secretary and humanist, whom the Emperor Charles IV had crowned poet laureate four years before, had informed Innocent of Niccolò's noble stance, but the tone of the pope's letter suggests that Niccolò's offer was not taken very seriously in Avignon.

⁵⁶ Misti, Reg. 29, fol. 14^v: "Super facto trium millium ducatorum pro custodia Smirnarum dicatur quod numquam promissimus solvere dicta tria millia ducatorum, sicut dicunt, sed quando primo venit Venetias dominus episcopus Morinensis [Raymond Saquet, bishop of Thérouanne, on

therefore, that no further funds were forthcoming from Venice at this time to help hold Smyrna against what were alleged to be constant Turkish attacks.⁵⁷

If Pierre and Benedetti were still in Venice in mid-July, they could not have reached the Anatolian coast before September. According to Philippe de Mézières, the legate's admiring friend and biographer, Pierre brought together the Venetian and Hospitaller galleys, and put into the threatened port of Smyrna, where Benedetti must have remained behind to take command. Pierre then went on to Constantinople, where he found John V hard pressed by the Turks, against whom he now threw into action the crews and men-at-arms of the galleys. The engagement took place at Lampsacus on the Dardanelles. By dint of their strenuous attacks (and the legate's fervent prayers) the crusaders captured Lampsacus, pillaged and burned the place, and then decided to withdraw to their galleys on the shore. According to Philippe de Mézières, Pierre had with him on the expedition fifty Hospitallers and many Venetians, Genoese, English and Greeks. The Turks were waiting in ambush for them, and when they attacked, the sailors and many others dropped their standards and fled in sad disorder toward the galleys.

But the fearless legate, "with the knights of the Hospital and some few other westerners, resisted the Turks face to face, [and] then the battle became worse, because our Christians were very few and the Turks innumerable." Warding off their attackers and attacking them in turn, the Hospitallers and the few stalwarts who had remained with them gradually made their way to the galleys, safe by the grace of God and the legate's blessing. Only seven of Pierre's retinue were killed, bravely fighting the Turks, but many of the crews had lost their lives in flight. About three hundred Turks were killed, including their leader, "and thus God wanted to give his legate a victory in the capture of the fortress, to show his courage and constancy in battle, and in the

whom see above], Apostolice Sedis legatus, pro una vice solum dedimus ei pro serviciis et necessitate tunc imminentibus ducatorum tria millia non ex debito vel promissione facta per nos sed ex sola liberalitate. . . ." Cf. above, note 19.

⁵⁷ Philippe de Mézières does say, however, that "whatever funds [Pierre Thomas] could get from Cyprus, Rhodes, and the states of Genoa and Venice he gloried in using [for the defense of Smyrna]" (*Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 89).

outcome of the battle to take vengeance upon his enemies."⁵⁸

If we can believe Mézières, Pierre Thomas almost wore himself out by his exertions. "By such works," he tells us,

that is by preaching, teaching, fighting, baptizing infidels, bringing schismatics back into the fold, and extending God's church, the lord legate was unremitting in his service, now at Smyrna, now off to Rhodes, Constantinople, Cyprus, the island of Crete, and Turkey, now with many galleys, now with a few, and sometimes with only one. He did not spare himself, putting to sea and making war, opportunely and otherwise, in winter as in summer, amid the perils of the sea . . . , hostile men, and false friars—he bore everything gladly, and labored so hard with God's help that during the period of his legation the Turks generally lost ground. One of the more important Turkish princes, namely the emir of Alto-luogo [Ephesus], paid tribute, which he had never done before to any legate or to any Christian, and thereafter he always honored the Christians in his land.⁵⁹

If these facts are accurate, and the emir of Ephesus thus came to terms with the Christian league (he was also concerned by the ongoing success of the Ottomans), the threat to Smyrna was obviously eased, and western merchantmen sailed more safely in the Aegean.

But with the Anglo-French conflict unresolved, conditions awry in the Neapolitan kingdom, Catalan Sicily under the interdict, Venetian and Genoese hostilities unallayed, the Hungarians in an expansionist mood, and Germany just recovering from chaos, Innocent VI and his hard-driving legate received no support from the great powers. Toward the end of 1359, however, Innocent again ordered the crusade to be preached, planned to arm new galleys at his own expense, and imposed crusading tithes to help finance a renewed effort against the Turks.⁶⁰ Pierre Thomas, on whom the crusade depended most of all, had overtaxed his strength and spent all available funds. Some time after the death of Hugh IV

of Cyprus (on 10 October, 1359),⁶¹ Pierre became ill, exhaustion fostered a persistent fever, and he sailed from Rhodes to Cyprus; according to Machaeras, he landed at Kyrenia on 8 December, and soon provoked a riot, trying to force Latin Catholicism upon the unwilling Cypriote Greeks.⁶²

Pierre Thomas's illness kept him in bed from Christmas until almost Easter (5 April, 1360),⁶³ when a rapid recovery enabled him to accede to the request of Peter I of Lusignan, the eldest surviving son of Hugh IV, to crown him king of Jerusalem. Hugh had already seen to Peter's coronation as king of Cyprus (on 24 November, 1358) in an effort to forestall the claims of a young grandson, also named Hugh, whose determined mother Marie of Bourbon could be depended on to assert her son's right to the throne.⁶⁴ The Lusignans received the crown of

⁵¹ Leontios Makhairas [Machaeras], *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle'*, ed. and trans. R. M. Dawkins, 2 vols., Oxford, 1932, I, bk. 1, par. 86, pp. 76, 78, and René de Mas Latrie, ed., *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, pt. I (Paris, 1891), 408.

⁵² Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, par. 101, pp. 88, 90, and cf. Amadi, *Chronique*, ed. Mas Latrie, pp. 409–10, but Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 92–93, places the riot which Pierre caused (in the cathedral of Nicosia) after the coronation of Peter I as king of Jerusalem on Easter Sunday, 1360.

⁵³ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 90, places the legate in Rhodes during the period of his illness, contrary to the account in Amadi and Machaeras. Francesco Amadi is a sixteenth-century compiler (on whom see the notice in the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, II [1960], 609), whose work is nevertheless of considerable value. Machaeras had access to much first-hand information. See the introduction to Dawkins's edition, esp. pp. 15–16. Born about 1380, Machaeras was a native of Cyprus, secretary in 1401–1402 of the Cypriote feudatory Jean de Norès (*ibid.*, I, bk. v, par. 631, p. 618), the son of Jacques de Norès, who was in the fleet of Peter I when the latter took Adalia in 1361 (I, bk. II, par. 119, p. 104, ὁ σὺν Τζάκε τε Νόρες), and who after the king's death in 1369 reluctantly threw in his lot with his murderers (I, bk. II, par. 281, p. 268). In the present instance it would be difficult (and not very important) to determine whether the chronology of Mézières is more accurate than that of Machaeras. The specificity with which Machaeras dates Pierre Thomas's arrival in Cyprus (on 8 December, 1359) carries a certain conviction, but it must be observed that Mézières is also an excellent source, and he informs us that he wrote his life of Pierre Thomas during the Lenten season of 1366, immediately after Pierre's death (ed. Smet, pp. 184–85).

⁵⁴ Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. 1, par. 86, pp. 76, 78, and bk. II, pars. 90, 104–8, pp. 80, 92–96; Mas Latrie, *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, pt. I (1891), 408, 410, and pt. II (1893), 35–36; Mas Latrie, ed., *Chronique de l'île de Chypre par Florio Bustron*, in *Mélanges historiques*, V (Paris, 1886), 257 (in the Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France); and cf. Mézières,

⁵⁸ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 84–86; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), pp. 140–41.

⁵⁹ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 86, and cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1359, no. 17, vol. VII (Lucca, 1752), p. 45.

⁶⁰ Reg. Vat. 244L, fol. 48r, dated 23 November, 1359, cited by Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 73, and by Smet in his edition of Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 210.

Cyprus at Nicosia and that of Jerusalem at Famagusta, where in the beautiful cathedral of S. Nicholas on Easter Sunday, 1360, Pierre Thomas, "clad in pontificals, solemnly accompanied by all the clergy," anointed Peter with holy oil, consecrated him, and placed the crown of Jerusalem upon his head "to the glory of God and his holy Church," says Mézières, "and the expansion of the faith and the destruction of the enemies of the cross."⁶⁵ Peter had long been interested in the crusade, and some years before his accession he had allegedly conceived the Order of the Sword (*l'Ordre de l'Espée*), whose members were to dedicate themselves to the recovery of the Holy Land.⁶⁶

From decade to decade and place to place the historian of this era is aware of social changes which manifested themselves in literature, siege tactics, and cookery, dress, painting, and architecture, but the crusade went on with extraordinary continuity, the papal answer to the eternal "eastern question." The recurring formulae of papal letters, however, as well as the standing epithets for abuse of the Turks, provide a rather misleading sense of repetitiveness, for from decade to decade conditions of peace or war in Europe, fear of the Turks, hostility to Egypt, availability of resources, popular response to crusading preachers, ability and personality of

leaders, and of course the fact of tranquillity or upheaval in the Apostolic See itself all helped or impeded the large task of organizing even a small expedition to the Levant. But it is hard to read the texts of 1359 without perceiving that the spirit of the Clementine crusades was still strong. Like Clement before and Urban after him, Innocent VI was devoted to the crusading ideal.

Doubtless conditions close at hand helped to keep the ideal close to Innocent's heart, for if the French and English would take the crusade seriously, they would have to make peace at home, and if they enrolled the *routiers* in the service of piety overseas, the Provençal countryside would be a safer place to live in, the wine would continue to flow into the papal cellars, grain into the bakeries, and building materials into the hands of the Avignonese contractors. But however strong the desire to hurl local trouble-makers against the distant Turks, the fact is that there were many curialists who (like Innocent and Pierre Thomas) worried about the fate of their fellow Christians in the Levant.

Pierre Thomas probably left Cyprus during the early summer of 1360. He visited his episcopal see of Coron, and spent some time in the Morea.⁶⁷ By this time King Peter I of Cyprus had already occupied the harbor town of Corycus (Gorigos) in Cilician Armenia, on the southern coast of Asia Minor opposite the Cypriote promontory of Cape Andreas. Corycus had once been an important shipping center, but for years the emirate Turks had been pressing in upon the despairing inhabitants, who had finally sent envoys to Peter, offering him the town (in January, 1360). The enterprising young king promptly sent the two Cypriote galleys of the Smyrniote league to occupy the place (*ὁ ρήγας ἔπεμψε κάτεργα τῆς Σμύρνης* . . .), and Latin Christendom had acquired another foothold on the Anatolian littoral.⁶⁸

Innocent VI must have known for some months of the presence of a Cypriote garrison in Corycus when he wrote Pierre Thomas on

Life of St. Peter Thomas, ed. Smet, p. 94; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (1948), 304, 308–10. Hugh IV's eldest son Guy, half-brother of Peter I and father of the young Hugh, "prince of Galilee," had died in 1346. In September of the following year Guy's widow Marie of Bourbon married Robert of Anjou, prince of Taranto and the Morea and Latin emperor of Constantinople, who pressed his step-son's claims to the throne of Cyprus (Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II [1845], Florence: doc. xx, pp. 131–34). King John II of France also supported young Hugh's claims.

⁶⁵ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 91–92; Amadi, p. 408; Strambaldi, p. 40; Florio Bustron, p. 258; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 105–7. Of early fourteenth-century Gothic construction, the cathedral church of S. Nicholas at Famagusta lost much of its upper story in the Turkish bombardment of 1571 (George Jeffery, *A Description of the Historic Monuments of Cyprus*, Nicosia, 1918, pp. 116–25, and Rupert Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus, a Guide to its Towns and Villages, Monasteries and Castles*, London, 1936, pp. 90–95). On the privileged status (and economic prosperity) of Famagusta, partly the consequence of its being the site of the Jerusalemite coronation, see Jean Richard, "La Situation juridique de Famagouste dans le royaume des Lusignans," *Πρακτικά τοῦ πρώτου διεθνoῦς κυπριολογικοῦ συνεδρίου* [*Proceedings of the First International Congress of Cypriote Studies*], II (Nicosia, 1972), 221–29.

⁶⁶ Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. Louis de Mas Latrie, Geneva, 1877, vv. 333–490, pp. 11–16; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 83–85.

⁶⁷ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 94–95.

⁶⁸ Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, pars. 112–14, pp. 98, 100, who says that Peter asked the pope's permission for continued use of the galleys at Corycus. See also the notes on the Greek text, in Dawkins, II, 96–99; Amadi, pp. 410–11; Strambaldi, pp. 42–44; Florio Bustron, p. 259; Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 628–40, p. 20; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 111–14.

12 October (1360) that the latter would be able more effectively to expedite and carry out the duties incumbent upon you as you are provided by us for this purpose with a larger authority to proceed in the areas in which you are the legate of the Apostolic See, in some of which besides the Turks there are known to be many other infidels such as Saracens and other diverse [foes]—against all such infidels we grant your fraternity the full and free faculty [to proceed] in such fashion as shall seem to you must justly and reasonably be done.⁶⁹

The meaning of this new "faculty" is unclear, but Pierre Thomas had certainly requested it. Its terms were vague enough to justify him in a wide range of procedures, since he would be the judge of what was *iuste et rationabiliter faciendum*. Pierre was undoubtedly in close communication with Peter I, and had probably authorized the initial use of the two "galleys of Smyrna." Something was being planned; we do not know what. The Venetian duke and council of Crete were alert, but (like us) they were also mystified. Two days after a curial clerk had prepared Innocent's rather cryptic response to Pierre's apparent request for the new faculty, the Venetian Senate convened (on 14 October, 1360), much exercised by the baffling news which had just come from the Levant:

... The lord legate of the league against the Turks [Pierre Thomas], as is stated in a letter of the duke and council of Crete, has abandoned the league . . . , which is the salvation of Christendom. He has gone to Cyprus with one of our Cretan galleys and with the two Cypriote galleys. He has [also] disarmed his own galley and the two galleys of the master of the Hospital, only our single Cretan galley being left in the service of the league, whence the greatest losses and perils could result for Christians [in the East], [and] which furthermore is expressly contrary to the agreement of the league and contrary to the intention of the lord pope and to our own intention. . . .

The Senate, therefore, voted to inform Innocent, the cardinals, and other appropriate persons of the legate's actions and the perils to which he had exposed the faithful in the eastern Mediterranean.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Reg. Aven. 144, fol. 563^r.

⁷⁰ Misti, Reg. 29, fol. 90^r, and cf. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 73, who quotes the first third or so of this text in a footnote, and says that Pierre dismantled the galleys because of his illness. But he had recovered, as we have seen, before April, 1360; the colonial government of Crete must have written to Venice about 1 September, since the Senate voted on 14 October to transmit their

The Venetians seem to have remained faithful to their commitment to the Christian league, despite recent charges to the contrary. On 26 December, 1360, however, "by reason of the news we have received from Constantinople [where some Venetians had been killed],⁷¹ and in order that our position may be stronger and more secure in those areas," the Senate voted to instruct the duke and council of Crete to send three armed galleys (previously assigned to patrol the Gulf) into the waters of Coron and Modon, where they should remain until March, 1361, and also ordered that the three galleys of the Gulf should be joined by "those two galleys which according to the terms of the league we must maintain against the Turks." But since the latter two galleys required hasty arming, it would seem that in the rather unnavigable

information to the Curia Romana. Also if the Senate had believed illness to be the cause of Pierre's apparent inactivity, it is hard to believe that they would not have alluded to his illness.

⁷¹ The Venetians were never popular in Constantinople after the Fourth Crusade, for obvious reasons, and despite the support they generally gave John V Palaeologus, they frequently disagreed with his policies. Shortly before this time an old dispute had arisen again between Venice and the imperial government as to the number of houses and vineyards which Venetian merchants and residents could own in Constantinople as well as to the land-tax, if any, which they were to pay (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 28, fols. 94^r–96^r, docs. dated 14 and 19 March, 1359; Freddy Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I [Paris, 1958], nos. 341–42, pp. 91–92). The issue was later settled for five years in the renewal of the quinquennial treaty between Venice and Byzantium on 13 March, 1363 (Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II [1899, repr. 1965], no. 53, pp. 88–89), at which time the Venetians were considering an alliance with Genoa and Byzantium (against the Ottoman Turks) for protection of the Sea of Marmara and the straits. John V had proposed the plan, but of course Venice and Genoa could not co-operate, and John apparently refused to give up Tenedos to the Venetians as the price of their alliance, on which note Thiriet, "Una Proposta di lega antiturca tra Venezia, Genova, e Bisanzio nel 1363," *Archivio storico italiano*, CXIII (1955), 321–34.

On the long and often troublesome history of the Palaeologian grants of commercial and other privileges to the Venetians (including the difficulties of 1359–1362, relating to Venetian ownership of property and payment of the *terraticum* or land-tax), see the excellent article by Julian Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi," *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 267–356, with twenty documents from the Misti. The issuance of Venetian naturalization papers to *gasmuli* and Greeks, who wanted to be Venetian subjects in order to escape the buyer's half of the Byzantine customs duties (or *commencia*, from which Venetians were entirely exempt), was also a frequent cause of dispute between the Senate and the Byzantine government.

months of December and January the colonial government of Crete had assumed the league would not be needing the two galleys.⁷³

Later on, to be sure, the Senate considered using the two galleys of the league to "conduct" two Venetian envoys to Constantinople.⁷³ It is not certain that they were so used, but in any event the Senate explicitly ordered that the two galleys should be promptly "returned to the service of the league."⁷⁴ On 22 July, 1361, the Savi agli Ordini proposed in the Senate that, if necessary for greater security, the Republic's "two galleys of the league" should be ordered to join an armed convoy on its way to Constantinople. The Savi were persistent, and the motion was put to the Senate four times. It was defeated every time,⁷⁵ and there is no evidence that Venice removed her two galleys from the service of the league during the critical summer of 1361, as Peter I of Cyprus extended his activities in Asia Minor.

It seems unlikely that the Cypriote "galleys of Smyrna" were disarmed. At least Machaeras, who had access to written sources "at the royal court,"⁷⁶ indicates that they were kept in use at Corycus long enough to require the pope's permission.⁷⁷ It is conceivable that Peter I and Pierre Thomas were acting in collusion to conceal their next move from the Venetians. The charges which the Senate leveled against Pierre may have been designed to elicit information from Avignon, since presumably Pierre sent reports of his crusading activities to the pope, if not to the doge.

Some galleys were doubtless put in dry dock, to be refitted for action the following year, for

according to Machaeras, Peter I gradually assembled a fleet of about 119 vessels, large and small, of which 46 were from Cyprus. Machaeras also says that Peter's fleet included two papal and four Hospitaller galleys. On 12 July, 1361, Peter held a muster of his naval armament at Famagusta. By now his objective was so widely known to be Adalia (Satalia, Antalya on the southern coast of Asia Minor, west of Corycus) that the emir of Tekke is alleged to have sent several embassies to Cyprus in an effort to dissuade him from the expedition. Adalia was the capital of Tekke, in the region of ancient Pamphylia. The emir's embassies were all to no avail, however, for on Monday, 23 August,⁷⁸ the Cypriote forces made a landing at "Tetramila" near Adalia, and took the town on the following evening. A month later Peter returned to Cyprus, landing at Kyrenia on 22 September (1361); he had left three armed galleys to guard Adalia, and the others were put in dry dock at Famagusta. During the weeks that followed, the emir of Tekke made three attempts to recover his capital, all unsuccessful. The conquest of Adalia was a victory of no small importance,⁷⁹ and the fame of the young king of Cyprus spread into the remotest villages of Europe.

Peter I had apparently faced a rather vague alliance of the Grand Karaman (the "Gran Caramano" of the Italians), whose capital had been established at Konya since 1335, and the emirs of Adalia, Alaya (Scandeloro), and Monov-

⁷³ Misti, Reg. 29, fol. 101^v.

⁷⁴ Misti, Reg. 29, fols. 107^v, 108^v, 109, 111^v, 113^v, 114^r.

⁷⁵ Misti, Reg. 29, fol. 114^v, dated 19 March, 1361: "Capta: Quod ordinetur et mandetur capitaneo Culfi quod si due galee de Creta deputate ad servicia unionis venissent vel venirent ad eum, debeat eas remittere ad servicia unionis. Et simile mandetur dictis duabus galeis," which should modify somewhat the observations of Smet in his edition of Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 210–11, and Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas* (1966), pp. 176–77, who follows him.

⁷⁶ Misti, Reg. 30, fol. 10^r. Smet and Boehlke, *opp. cit.*, have both misunderstood the document, which lacks the cross in the left margin of the register (and so the motion was never put into effect).

⁷⁷ Cf. *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, bk. 1, par. 86, p. 76, and bk. II, par. 90, p. 80, ἡῦρα γραμμένον, and especially par. 112, p. 98, καθὼς τὸ ἡῦραν γραμμένον εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ρηγάτικην, "as I have found recorded at the royal court."

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, I, bk. II, par. 114, p. 100.

⁷⁸ Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 121, p. 106, says "on the third day, the twenty-third of August" (τῇ γ', τῇ κγ' αὐγούστου), i.e. on Tuesday, but in 1361 the twenty-third fell on Monday. In his notes to Machaeras's text Dawkins, II, 14, observes that "the frequency with which . . . not only the year and the month are given but also the day of the week, suggests a use of written sources." The evidence seems to be pretty strong that Machaeras used documentary data available "at the royal court." But I think that, given the date, he sometimes tried to figure out the day of the week for himself. Without Mas Latrie's *Trésor de chronologie*, Grotefend's *Zeitrechnung*, or Cappelli's *Cronologia*, this would be a considerable task for any historian of my acquaintance, with the result "that out of the roughly hundred and fifty cases, in about fifty the day of the month and the day of the week do not agree" (Dawkins, *loc. cit.*).

⁷⁹ Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, bk. II, pars. 116–18, pp. 102–12, and on Adalia, the ancient Attalia, see, *ibid.*, II, 101–3; Amadi, *Chronique*, ed. Mas Latrie, pp. 411–12, who says that Peter had 106 vessels in his fleet, including 46 galleys, "computando le quattro galie de Rhodi et la gallia che venne il legato" [but Pierre Thomas was not on the expedition]. See also Strambaldi, pp. 45–49; Florio Bustron, pp. 259–60; Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 641–60, pp. 20–21; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 119–27.

gat, none of whom had moved to prevent his landing at Adalia. But now the emirs of Alaya and Monovgat recognized Peter's overlordship, sent him envoys with presents, offered to fly the royal banner of Lusignan, and promised to pay him tribute.⁸⁰ Philippe de Mézières tells us that the legate Pierre Thomas was overjoyed when he learned of Peter's "unheard-of victory." He had apparently returned to Cyprus after his sojourn in the Morea, and now he hurried off to Adalia (presumably in October, 1361) to consecrate churches and establish priests to celebrate mass. He encouraged the Cypriote garrison in their defense of the town, and bestowed upon them "many spiritual privileges." Then he left for Cyprus, where he organized processions and arranged for masses to be said in honor of Peter's victory over the Moslems, "and in wondrous fashion he aroused the king, the nobles, and even the [Greek] population of Cyprus to the destruction of the enemies of the faith."⁸¹

Some destruction of Christians also lay in the offing, for from the fall of 1361 to the late summer of 1363 the plague ravaged the Mediterranean world (and spread northward), the worst visitation of the black death since 1348. The mortality was high in Constantinople and the Morea, Asia Minor and Syria, Rhodes and Naples, where it terrified the inhabitants during the summer of 1363. It came to Cyprus too. Mézières has described Pierre Thomas's tireless efforts during the summer of 1362 in Nicosia and Famagusta—he held masses, preached sermons, and organized processions—to allay the divine wrath by calling the church, the court, and the populace to repentance for their obvious sins. In the seaport of Famagusta, *foenax pestilentiae et mortalitatis*, the stricken were dying at the rate of thirty or forty a day, but one day the appeals of the legate and the tears of the people were heard, "and from that pathetic day in Famagusta and in all parts of the kingdom of Cyprus the pestilence receded, owing to God's mercy and the legate's prayers."⁸²

Philippe de Mézières had witnessed the legate's pious heroism during the Cypriote plague, and was straightway drawn to him because of his dedication to the crusade. Fed on chronicles relating to the Holy Land from his early youth at Amiens in Picardy, Philippe remained always a romantic, a visionary, and a crusader. He was often disappointed, but never entirely disillusioned. The two princes he loved the most, Andrew of Hungary, the husband of Joanna I of Naples, and Peter I of Lusignan, the adventurous king of Cyprus, were both murdered by traitors in their midst. During his declining years among the Celestines in Paris, Philippe "le vieil pèlerin" was to contemplate the sadness of their lot and the divine chastisement of unworthy crusaders who had hamstrung their own efforts by avarice and vainglory, incompetence and lack of discipline. But in 1361 Philippe was still young, thirty-four or thirty-five years of age, and full of dreams to help rewin the Holy Land from the Moslems. Shortly after the taking of Adalia, Peter I made him chancellor of Cyprus, and immediately thereafter Philippe met the legate Pierre Thomas, whom he came to love and admire beyond all men, and whose life he described in "un très beau livre de propagande pour la croisade."⁸³ Enthusiasm for the crusade ebbed and flowed from decade to decade, and now the tide was beginning to rise again.

From Nicosia on 15 June, 1362, Peter I, *Ierusalem et Cipri rex*, addressed a rhetorical letter to the Florentine government, appealing

struck Cyprus (as it did other parts of the Levant) before that date, on which note R. J. Loenertz, "Emmanuelis Raul epistolae XII," in *Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, XXVI (1956), *ep.* 3, pp. 142–45, and "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," in the *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II, pt. 1 (Studi e testi, 232; Città del Vaticano, 1964), 416–17. Loenertz also calls attention to Demetrius Cydonēs' despairing references to the plague of 1361–1362 (*Correspondance*, I [1956], *epp.* 108–10, pp. 145, 147–48).

But the ravages of the plague in Cyprus were apparently even greater in 1363, as we gather from Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. 1, par. 66, p. 60, and bk. II, par. 135, p. 118; Amadi, p. 412; and Strambaldi, p. 53. The register or letter book of Pierre d'Ameil, archbishop of Naples (1363–1365), in the Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Arm. LIII, tom. 9, provides much evidence for the plague in his episcopal city during the summer of 1363 (on which cf. K. M. Setton, in *Speculum*, XXVIII [1953], 651, 653, 654–55, and Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 385, 396, 400: "Hoc anno [1363] fuit pestilentia gravissima quasi per omnes partes mundi").

⁸³ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 109, 129–31, 345, *et passim*.

⁸⁰ Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, pars. 124–25, p. 108, and see the references in the preceding note to Amadi, Strambaldi, and Florio Bustron. On the Turcoman principalities in Asia Minor, note Osman Turan, "Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks," in P. M. Holt, A. K. S. Lambton, and B. Lewis, eds., *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I (1970), 251–53.

⁸¹ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 96–97.

⁸² Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 97–100. Since Pierre Thomas left Cyprus with Peter I on 24 October, 1362, as we shall see, to seek support for the crusade in Europe, the plague had obviously

for aid to help him recover the city of Jerusalem, the Holy Sepulcher, the site of Calvary, and the sacred places in the hands of the Saracens. The scenes of Christ's life and death were subject to daily desecration and to constant attempts to destroy both Christians and their faith. Owing to past as well as to present sins, God had allowed pestilence and war to reign, "nec . . . Terram Sanctam esse voluit in manibus christianis." But Peter said that he had yearned from childhood [like Mézières, who almost certainly composed the letter] to undertake the recovery of the Holy Land. God had made him seize upon this project, which filled his heart, and to which he pledged the kingdom of Cyprus and his knights, along with all who would join him in the enterprise. The kingdom of Jerusalem was his by the natural law of inheritance.

Peter would atone for his sins by striving for the territorial increase of the Christian faith, notwithstanding the great costs in men and resources which he had incurred in the capture of Adalia (Satalia), "which God has conferred upon us in a miracle, and we must not keep secret the fact that it was a miracle, for it has remade our desire, our will, and our objective. . . ." Peter therefore appealed to the Florentines, all and singly each according to his means, to help him regain the Jerusalemite heritage, the land where Christ had redeemed the fallen nature of mankind by the shedding of his own blood. In order that everyone might have adequate time "ad veniendum nobiscum in servitio sancto Dei," Peter set 1 March, 1364, as the date for the crusaders to assemble. His familiar, Sylvester Bolonchini, bearer of this letter to Florence, would inform the Signoria as to the details.⁸⁴

According to the chroniclers, Peter I sailed from Paphos on Monday, 24 October, 1362, with a retinue of Cypriote knights. The legate Pierre Thomas and the chancellor Philippe de Mézières sailed with him, and the latter says they went to seek in the West assistance of the kings and the Emperor Charles IV, for Peter knew well that he lacked "sufficient force of men and arms to take the Holy Land." Stopping off briefly at Rhodes, the king's small fleet went on

to Venice, where it arrived on or about 5 December. Peter was royally received by the young Doge Lorenzo Celsi, Petrarch's friend, and was lodged in the Palazzo Corner-Piscopia (now the Municipio) on the Grand Canal, just south of the Rialto Bridge. The palace then belonged to Andrea Zane, the podestà of Treviso. The Senate allowed Zane to leave his post and return home for two days and one night (hardly time enough for the ride from Treviso to Venice and back again), obviously since the king wished personally to thank his absent host.⁸⁵

Peter and the doge discussed the Turkish peril,⁸⁶ and the doge could tell him that shortly before his arrival the Senate had voted to arm twelve galleys, six in Venice and six in Crete, "ad custodiam Culfi et Romanie."⁸⁷ Peter received the assurance of ships and supplies for the crusade, but he was to keep secret the Venetian pledge of assistance.⁸⁸ The Senate was just on the point of sending ambassadors to Avignon, and ". . . the lord king of Cyprus urgently requests, both for his honor and for the progress of the business for which he is come," that they should attend him, and prepare the way for his arrival at the Curia, as a mark of the bonds which now linked Venice to Cyprus. The Senate agreed to have their ambassadors do as the king wished.⁸⁹ Peter left Venice on 2 January, 1363,

⁸⁴ Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 129–31, pp. 112–16; Amadi, p. 412; Strambaldi, p. 50; and cf. Florio Bustron, pp. 260–61, who gives no date; Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 102–4; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 142–47; Louis de Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II (Paris, 1852), 239–41, note, traces Peter I's itinerary both during his long sojourn in Europe (from December, 1362, to June, 1365) and during the shorter period he later spent in Italy (from early in 1368 until the following September). On 10 December, 1362, the Venetian Senate voted "quod concedatur nobili viro Ser Andree Zane, potestati nostro Tarvisii, quod possit venire Venetias per duos dies, non hospitando nisi una nocte extra terram" (Misti, Reg. 30, fol. 122^r).

The Palazzo Zane was later acquired by the Corner, and has long been known as the Palazzo Corner-Piscopia from the family's rich sugar plantation at Episkopi, west of Limassol, in Cyprus. Among the escutcheons on the façade may still be seen the arms of Lusignan. Today commonly called the Palazzo Loredan, from the family which acquired it in the eighteenth century (and held it until 1816), it forms with the adjoining Palazzo Farsetti the center of the municipal government of Venice (cf. Giulio Lorenzetti, *Venice and its Lagoons*, Rome, 1961, pp. 94–96).

⁸⁵ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 148–49.

⁸⁶ Misti, Reg. 30, fol. 119^r, dated 30 November, 1362.

⁸⁷ Cf. Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 103, and Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 148–49.

⁸⁸ Misti, Reg. 30, fol. 124^r, dated 31 December, 1362.

⁸⁴ Giuseppe Müller, ed., *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll' Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi*, Florence, 1879, pt. I, doc. LXXXII, pp. 119, 474. On 15 September (1362) Peter wrote Niccolò Acciajuoli, grand seneschal of the kingdom of Naples, of his determination to go on the crusade, and thanked him for his "magnificent offer of galleys" (Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II [1845], Florence: doc. XXI, pp. 134–35).

and with the permission of the Maggior Consiglio the doge accompanied him to some point beyond Mestre and Marghera.⁹⁰

Peter I went on to Padua, Vicenza, and Verona, arriving at Milan on 21 January (1363). He remained for some days with Bernabò Visconti (who promised him aid), and then continued his journey through Pavia, Voghera, and Tortona. He reached Genoa in early February, and was still there on 5 March, when he renewed the extraterritorial rights and trading privileges which his predecessor Henry I had granted the Genoese (on 10 June, 1232). Among the witnesses we find the name of "Philippus de Mayzeriis, regni Chipri cancellarius."⁹¹ Pierre Thomas had already left for the Curia Romana, but Peter wanted to be sure the coast was clear before venturing into Avignon, where curial sentiment still appeared to be rather in favor of his young nephew Hugh, the prince of Galilee, who showed no signs of relaxing his claims to the kingdom of Cyprus.

The pope who awaited Peter at Avignon was not, however, Innocent VI. Of uncertain health and a pacific disposition, he had suffered from the frustrations of a turbulent reign. His hopes and plans for the crusade had come to nothing, but Smyrna still remained in Christian hands when he died on 12 September, 1362. He was interred at the Chartreuse which he had built at Villeneuve, across the river from Avignon, and visitors to Villeneuve may still see his handsome Gothic tomb in the partially restored convent, where he had found brief periods of repose, and where he wished to be buried.⁹²

On 14 September, 1362, the Sacred College addressed letters to Cardinal Gil de Albornoz, legate of the Apostolic See in Italy, the citizens of Bologna, the Estensi of Ferrara, the Scaligeri

of Verona, the Carraresi of Padua, and others, informing them of the lugubrious fact of Innocent VI's death and directing them to preserve the states, properties, and rights of the Roman Church.⁹³ After the novena of mourning the cardinals entered the conclave in the papal palace at Avignon on 22 September; on the twenty-eighth they elected the abbot of S. Victor of Marseille, Guillaume de Grimoard, who was then serving as nuncio in the kingdom of Naples, whence he was hastily recalled to Avignon. He arrived on 31 October, and on 6 November his coronation was held in the palace.⁹⁴ He took the name Urban V, and announced his elevation to the world on 7 November.⁹⁵

The legate Pierre Thomas was among the recipients of the announcement. Urban asked him "to support our frailness by your devout prayers to the All Highest," and to continue to assume and discharge the responsibilities of his legatine office.⁹⁶ Twelve days later, following in the footsteps of his two predecessors, who had imposed a tithe on the kingdom of Cyprus "for the suppression of the Turks," Urban directed the archbishop of Nicosia and his suffragans to pay the crusading tithe for another three years for the defense of Smyrna against the Turks.⁹⁷

Scarcely another ten days had passed when Urban wrote King Peter I of Cyprus (on 29 November, 1362), as the latter was sailing up the Adriatic toward Venice. The letter was,

⁹⁰ A. Theiner, ed., *Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis S. Sedis*, II (Rome, 1862, repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1964), no. CCCLXVI, pp. 402-3, "datum Avinione XVIII Kalendas Octobris," i.e. 14 September, not the eighteenth, as stated in Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, p. 1, note 1.

⁹¹ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 349-50, 383-84, 394-95, 398-99; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1362, nos. 2-7, vol. VII (XXVI, Lucca, 1752), pp. 64-68; Souchon, *Die Papstwahlen von Bonifaz VIII. bis Urban VI.* (1888), pp. 66-73; Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (1949), pp. 109-10.

⁹² Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1 (1902), nos. 1-102, pp. 1-9; Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus*, II, no. CCCLXVII, p. 403; Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, VIII (1932), 177-80.

⁹³ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 5, p. 3, summarizing Reg. Vat. 245, fol. 5.

⁹⁴ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 113, p. 11, dated 19 November, 1362. Some ten or eleven weeks later, however, since agents of the papal legate Pierre Thomas had been illegally "preaching the word of the cross against the Turks" in the Neapolitan kingdom, where Pierre had been given no legatine authority, Urban ordered Cardinal Albornoz to put a stop to their activities and to apply the funds they had collected for the crusade to the defense of the states of the church in Italy (*ibid.*, no. 197, p. 23, dated 2 February, 1363, and note Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 177-78).

The ambassadors were later instructed to leave for Avignon not later than 3 February, 1363 (*ibid.*, fol. 128^v).

⁹⁰ Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II, doc. III, p. 247. In the "coronation oath" (*promissio*) a doge undertook not to leave the *ducatus Venetiarum* without the express permission of the Maggior Consiglio.

⁹¹ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 150-52; Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II, 51-56, 248-49; Reinhold Röhrich, *Regesta regni hierosolymitani*, Innsbruck, 1893, no. 1037, p. 271 (on the Cypriote concession of 1232); Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (1948), 118-19, 325.

⁹² Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 328, 329-30, 334, 342, and vol. II, pp. 485-86, 487-88; Eugène Déprez, "Les Funérailles de Clément VI et d'Innocent VI d'après les comptes de la cour pontificale," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XX (1900), 241-44, 248-50.

presumably, delivered to him at the Palazzo Zane near the Rialto. Urban stated that ambassadors of Marie of Bourbon, now the titular Latin empress of Constantinople, and her son Hugh, the prince of Galilee, had recently come to the Curia Romana. They had presented "certain petitions, of which we transmit herewith the contents to your royal Serenity," relating to Hugh's claims to the Cypriote throne. His Holiness, to whom despite his unworthiness (the letter reads) God had entrusted the care of all Christians, was most anxious that the faithful should live at peace with one another, especially those of high estate who were linked by blood and were exposed to the peril of Turkish attack. He urged Peter for his own honor to deal in fair and kindly fashion with his relatives, Marie and Hugh, and to discharge his obligations to them with a generosity befitting a king, for "with the said Hugh, who is the bone of your bones and the flesh of your flesh, and whom you should look upon as your son, you should take care to deal piously and benevolently to satisfy the debt of blood and pay heed to your own honor and peace of mind." Urban offered his services as mediator, and added somewhat insistently, "And since, as we have heard, our predecessor Pope Innocent VI of happy memory wrote you tactfully of these matters a long time ago, and your Highness has sent him no answer—which we find so hard to believe—it becomes your royal prudence to delay no longer in sending us a sincere and reasonable response."⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 245, fols. 16^v–17^r, "datum Avinione III Kal. Decembris anno primo," with a brief summary in Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 119, p. 12. According to Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, pars. 105–8, 129, 131, pp. 92–96, 112–14, Hugh of Galilee's claim against Cyprus was settled for 50,000 Cypriote aspers (*ν' χιλιάδες ἄσπρα τῆς Κύπρου*). The Cypriote asper was the "white bezant" (*ὀνόμισμα ἄσπρον*); in one passage Machaeras, *op. cit.*, I, bk. I, par. 9, p. 8, says that four white bezants were worth one ducat, but the weight and value of the coin are variously given (*ibid.*, II, 46–47). Silver coins called "aspers" were widely used in the Levant in both Christian and Moslem centers of trade (cf. Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, *La Pratica della mercatura*, ed. Allan Evans, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, *passim*).

On 28 June, 1360, at the end of a letter of rather belated consolation to Peter I on the death of his father Hugh IV, Innocent VI had alluded to Prince Hugh of Galilee's rights to the throne (see the text in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1360, nos. 13–14). Innocent had feared that the dispute over the succession might lead to civil war in Cyprus, and on 24 May he had already written Peter, asking for fuller information concerning his own right of succession (*ibid.*, nos. 15–16). These are the letters which Peter did not answer.

On the same day (29 November, 1362) Urban wrote also to Peter I's brother John, prince of Antioch, and to the legate Pierre Thomas, asking them both to intercede with Peter on Hugh of Galilee's behalf. In the letter to Pierre Thomas, Urban states it to be his understanding that in the discharge of his legatine duties Pierre found himself frequently in the king's company.⁹⁹ The transmission of mail being what it was at the time, Peter and the legate could hardly have received the papal letters before the middle of December, if indeed so soon, and they doubtless conferred on the question of Peter's response. Pierre Thomas would soon be leaving for Avignon. He would offer the pope suitable explanations of the points at issue in the contested succession, and possibly he agreed to apprise Peter of the pope's reaction. Actually there was little that Urban could do about the Cypriote matter. It was almost inconceivable that he should take a stand against Peter, for that would obviously put the crusade hopelessly in jeopardy.

Pierre Thomas was well received at the Curia Romana, where he knew some of the cardinals, especially Elias Talleyrand of Périgord. Everyone was interested in the details of his legatine mission, "and just as Paul brought the name of Christ before the kings and princes," says Philippe de Mézières, "so the legate glorified King [Peter's] name before the pope, the cardinals, and princes, and announced his plans for the crusade." If Peter I was making history, so was Pierre Thomas, and on 6 March (1363) Urban V transferred him from the episcopal see of Coron to the archiepiscopacy of Crete.¹⁰⁰ King John II of France was then at the Curia, having arrived in Avignon on 20 November (1362); he was residing at Villeneuve, across the Rhone, in the (summer) residence of Clement VI.¹⁰¹ Everyone was eager to see the young

⁹⁹ Reg. Vat. 245, fol. 17, with brief notices in Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 120–21, pp. 12–13.

¹⁰⁰ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet (1954), pp. 104–5; Reg. Aven. 155, fols. 33^v–34^v; Eubel, I, 215. The Cretans and clergy and the vassals of the Cretan Church were notified of Pierre's translation to their island see; the previous incumbent Orso Dolfin had become patriarch of Grado in November, 1361 (Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 266), on which note D. Rattinger, "Der Liber Provisionum praelatorum Urbani V," in the *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, XV (Munich, 1894), 58, 64.

¹⁰¹ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 384, 395, 399. John II had left Paris, to travel south by easy stages, in August, 1362, not 1363, as stated by Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 160.

king of Cyprus, who remained at Genoa until he received an assuring letter from Pierre Thomas; then he took to the road, and reached Avignon on Wednesday of Holy Week, 29 March (1363); "and there he was piously and lovingly received by the pope, the king of France, and the cardinals." Two days later, on the thirty-first, the Friday before Easter, Urban celebrated mass, and with his own hands bestowed the crusader's cross upon John II, Peter I, Cardinal Talleyrand of Périgord, "and a host of barons and nobles."¹⁰²

Pope Urban named John II "rector and captain-general" of the expedition, and designated Cardinal Talleyrand as the legate to go with him. At the same time Urban informed Archbishop Roger le Fort of Bourges and the bishops of Mende and S. Flour that he was giving John a tithe to be levied in France together with unassigned and unspent gifts, fines, legacies, penances, and the like of the past twelve years and similar *subsidia* for the next six "to help with the vast expenses" of the projected expedition. The French hierarchy was to gather the allotted funds every six months and remit them in gold to the Curia within two months of each collection, and rather elaborate precautions were supposed to be taken to see that this financial harvest was expended solely on the crusade. Papal letters went out to most of the important princes and prelates of Christendom, announcing the crusade (which was to set out on 1 March, 1365), granting the crusaders the usual indulgences, and taking their possessions under the protection of the Holy See.¹⁰³ Thieves and usurers in a penitent mood could secure absolution for their transgressions by contributing their *male acquisita* to the crusading coffers,¹⁰⁴ and a like concession was extended to the arch-

dioceses of Crete, Corfu, and Rhodes to assist the king of Cyprus, *qui est ad presens apud Sedem Apostolicam constitutus*.¹⁰⁵

The Turks were on the move, and may have occupied Adrianople as early as January, 1361. The emirs of Asia Minor were still sending piratical expeditions into the Aegean. It was time for a crusade. King Peter I of Cyprus spent some thirty months in Europe, of which he passed about seventeen in travel from England to Poland, seeking assistance for the expedition he planned. His fellow monarchs welcomed him everywhere with great feasts and abundant honors, but they gave him little help. Peter had arrived in Avignon, as we have seen, on 29 March (1363); he remained in the area until 31 May,¹⁰⁶ and the Curia took a great interest in his affairs. Taking leave of his admirers in Avi-

¹⁰² Reg. Aven. 155, fols. 241^v–242^r, and Reg. Vat. 261, fol. 6^r, "datum Avinione II Kal. Aprilis pontificatus nostri anno primo" (31 March, 1363), and note Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, p. 213.

¹⁰³ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 158–59 (where the date should be 1363), 172 ff. We have observed that Peter arrived in Venice from the East on 5 December, 1362, on which cf. Iorga, *op. cit.*, p. 147, where the date 1361 is also wrong, and the tale of Peter's falling into the water with the collapse of a Venetian bridge should be referred to his return to Venice (on 11 November, 1364), whence he sailed on 27 June, 1365, for the island of Rhodes and the epic adventure of the Alexandria Crusade (*ibid.*, pp. 199–200, 277; Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 205, 256, 268; and Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 324–29). John II of France had left Avignon to return to Paris on 9 May (1363); Peter departed on the thirty-first (Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 384–85, 396, 400). With reference to Peter's presence in Avignon and Montpellier, we may note that on 11 April (1363) the Camera Apostolica paid three florins for the repair of some jewelery which Urban gave him (K. H. Schäfer, ed., *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter den Päpsten Urban V. und Gregor XI. [1362–1378]*, Paderborn, 1937, p. 12), and on 10 June the Camera paid a papal sergeant-at-arms 51 florins "for expenses at Pont-de-Sorgues on behalf of the king of Cyprus and his retinue when he left the Curia" (*ibid.*, p. 13).

We should also note that Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La Conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs . . .," in *Travaux et mémoires*, I (Paris, 1965), 439–61, esp. pp. 452–58, 461, has sought to show by the rationalization of confused sources that the first Turkish occupation of Adrianople was achieved by non-Ottoman forces between 1365 and 1369, and that the Ottomans did not take over the city until about 1377. She dismisses, without quoting, the important testimony of Gian Giacomo Caroldo, secretary of the Council of Ten in Venice at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Caroldo, however, was a great reader of Venetian archival documents, some of which were destroyed by fire in the 1570's, and he informs us that the Turks occupied Adrianople early in the year 1361. These Turks were quite possibly from one of the emirates, i.e., not Ottomans, and may have been established in Thrace for some time.

¹⁰² Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 105; Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 352–53, 396, 400, and vol. II, p. 499; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 165–66.

¹⁰³ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 346–47, pp. 40–41, dated 31 March, 1363, and note no. 868, pp. 129–30, also dated 31 March one year later; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1363, nos. 14–22, vol. VII, pp. 85–90; Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 352–53, 384–85, 396, 400; on Talleyrand, see, *ibid.*, II, 272 ff., and Norman P. Zacour, *Talleyrand: The Cardinal of Périgord*, Philadelphia, 1960; Delachenal, *Chronique des règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*, I (1910), 337, 339; Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., *Œuvres de Froissart: Chroniques*, XVII (Brussels, 1872), p. 401; Maurice Prou, *Étude sur les relations politiques du pape Urbain V avec les rois de France Jean II et Charles V (1362–1370)*, Paris, 1888, pp. 23–28; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 158–62, 165–70; Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 211–16.

¹⁰⁴ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 344–45, p. 40.

gnon, he went north into France, the Rhineland, back to France and Normandy. He spent November, 1363, in England, where he enjoyed the feasts at Westminster and a great tournament at Smithfield,¹⁰⁷ but Urban V thought that he was tarrying too long. On 28 November he sent Peter a letter of remonstrance (apparently still unpublished), reminding him that when he was at Avignon he had admonished him to pay the visits he wanted to make to the various kings and princes as quickly as possible, and then return to Cyprus, which lay at the very mouth of peril. Now Urban had been informed that the Turks were planning an attack upon Peter's kingdom, and had laid siege to Adalia (Antalya), which Peter had taken by assault in August, 1361, "and we pray that you not delay your

return any longer, and may God help make it a fruitful return."¹⁰⁸

Conditions in France and Italy impeded mobilization of the large forces which Urban had envisaged, but he made every effort to prepare the way for an expedition to the East. He tried to reconcile Charles the Bad of Navarre with his royal relatives of France and of Aragon-Catalonia to help further the "work of piety overseas."¹⁰⁹ The raids of the unemployed *routiers* were a terrible problem in southern France, and papal funds were disappearing in the costly struggle against Bernabò Visconti in northern Italy. John II and Peter I sent envoys in an attempt to make peace. Peter was represented by his chancellor Mézières and by the ubiquitous Pierre Thomas. As Urban wrote Cardinal Gil de Albornoz in Italy (on 1 May, 1363),

. . . The illustrious kings, John of France and Peter of Cyprus, who panting like boxers of Christ for the recovery of the Holy Land have promised with their hands in ours to sail overseas within a set time, are now sending certain ambassadors—both to hasten their expedition and to bring peace and quiet to the Roman Church and to Lombardy—to that perfidious Bernabò Visconti, the enemy of God and of his Holy Church, to try to induce the said Bernabò, if they can,

Caroldo says that the news of the Turkish seizure of Adrianople reached Venice on 14 March, 1361 (and it had probably taken seven or eight weeks to do so): "Venne nova a Venetia alli 14 marzo 1361 come Turchi facevano per mare molti danni contra i lochi dell' imperator Joanne Paleologo et legni de mercatanti venetiani, et per terra già havevano preso Calipoli [at the beginning of March, 1354] e Andrinopoli [in January, 1361?] . . ." (Bibl. Nazionale Marciana, MS. Ital., Cl. VII, no. 128a [8639], fol. 286^v, cited by R. J. Loenertz, "Études sur les chroniques brèves byzantines," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXIV [1958], 156–62, who tries to show that a group of Byzantine "short chronicles" confirms Caroldo's date and assigns the [Ottoman] seizure of Adrianople to Murad I before his victory over the Serbs in the battle of Černomen on the Maritsa on 26 September, 1371). The last word has not been said on the battle of Černomen, however, at which Murad was probably not present (see the interesting Ottoman texts discussed by Mrs. Beldiceanu, "La Conquête d' Andrinople," pp. 450–51).

If the Turks who took Adrianople at the beginning of 1361 (according to Caroldo) were in fact Ottomans, they presumably lost the city in the early 1360's during Murad's struggle with his brothers over the succession to their father Orkhan. In any event a poem composed by the contemporary John Katakalon seems to make it clear that the Byzantines had reoccupied Adrianople before Christmas of 1366, on which cf. E. A. Zachariadou, "The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks," *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 211–17, who agrees with Mrs. Beldiceanu that the Turks first took the city about 1369, but pays no attention to the evidence in Caroldo.

In their westward expansion through Thrace the Ottomans took Serres (Serrai) in 1383. See the discussion by Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La Prise de Serres et le firman de 1372 en faveur du monastère de Saint-Jean-Prodrome," in *Acta historica* [published by the Societas academica dacoromana in Munich], IV (1965), 15–24. Mrs. Beldiceanu throws doubt on the authenticity of the firman, which has been used as evidence to suggest an earlier occupation of Serres, and claims that the (lost) original could not in any event antedate the Turkish occupation of Serres in 1383.

¹⁰⁷ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 173–82.

¹⁰⁸ Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 13^v–14^r, by original enumeration: "Carissimo in Christo filio Petro Regi Ciprio illustri salutem, etc. Dudum considerantes attente multa magnaue pericula que ob tue serenitatis a tuo regno et ultramarinis partibus absenciam diuturnam possent eisdem regno et partibus probabiliter evenire, serenitatem eandem tunc apud sedem apostolicam existentem fuimus exhortati paternis affectibus ut visitatis regibus et principibus quos decreveras visitandos quam cito commode posses ad dictum tuum regnum inter fauces hostium fidei constitutum remeare curares. Nuper autem intellecto quod perfidi Turchi dictum regnum conantur offendere et circa civitatem tuam Sataliensem tenent exercitum numerosum propter que magis oportet quod ad illas partes celeriter revertaris, excellenciam regiam hortamur attentius et precamur quatinus regressum tuum deo auxiliante felicem ad dictas partes ulterius non retardes. Nos enim litteras apostolicas super subsidiis que tibi concessimus, quantum potest fieri, facimus expediri prout venerabilis frater noster Antonius episcopus Melfiensis confessor tuus lator presentium qui expeditionem litterarum ipsarum et alia que sibi commisit regia celsitudo diligenter prosecutus extitit tue magnitudini referet oraculo vive vocis. Datum Avinione IIII Kal. Decembris anno secundo." Cf., *ibid.*, fol. 208, letter of Urban V to Peter dated at Avignon on 3 June, 1364 (misdated in Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 203–4), and fol. 241^v, letter dated 30 June, noted in Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 2 (1906), no. 1051, pp. 163–64.

¹⁰⁹ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 354, p. 42, dated 15 April, 1363, and Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 169, with the wrong date.

freely to give back to the Roman Church all the castles which he holds in the Bolognese as well as the castle of Lugo. . . .¹¹⁰

Although John II's envoys failed in their effort, Pierre Thomas succeeded in bringing the Visconti to terms, according to the eyewitness account of Mézières,¹¹¹ which seems to be borne out by the chronicles of Bologna.¹¹² Peace was announced on 20 January, 1364, but final settlement did not come until 13 March, and for his withdrawal from the Bolognese, Bernabò Visconti was to receive from the Holy See 500,000 florins "of good gold and just weight," to be paid over a period of eight years in annual installments of 62,500 florins.¹¹³ The wisdom of the agreement may be debatable, but at the time it seemed like a necessary first step toward getting the crusade under way.

Whatever the distractions at the Curia, and whatever the problems in Italy, Urban V kept his mind upon the East. On 12 May, 1363, he appointed the Genoese Pietro Raccanelli captain

of Smyrna for ten years, and arranged that he be paid 6,000 florins a year "for stipends for himself and his servitors." The master of the Hospital was to be responsible for half the sum, and the archdeacon of Limassol, the papal collector in Cyprus, was to see to the payment of the other half.¹¹⁴ Like his two predecessors Urban was determined to hold on to Smyrna.

It would require all Raccanelli's competence to maintain law and order in threatened Smyrna, where certain "sons of iniquity" openly challenged the authority of the papal vicar Pietro Patricelli of Fano. Pietro was a Franciscan lay brother (*conversus*), a *familiaris* of Clement VI and Innocent VI, and was quietly discharging his duties, providing instruction in the Latin faith and harassing the local Moslems. The "sons of iniquity" broke down the doors of the houses occupied by Pietro and his retainers, and carried off grain, wine, and food as well as beds, clothes, utensils, arms, and other things. On 16 June (1363) Urban wrote the archbishops of Rhodes and Smyrna and the bishop of Chios to give the offenders public warning in the churches to return the stolen goods within a given time or give full satisfaction for their value or face the ban of excommunication.¹¹⁵

Two weeks after Raccanelli's appointment, as Peter I was preparing to leave Avignon, there was another spurt of activity in the apostolic palace, and clerks prepared letters for dispatch to the Emperor Charles IV, Edward III of England, John of Bohemia, the dukes of Luxembourg, Austria, Saxony, and Bavaria, the nobles of Germany and Lorraine, and the doges of Venice and Genoa, exhorting them all to get

¹¹⁰ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 387, p. 53. On the ravages of the *rouliers*, see in general Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans*, II (1899, repr. 1965), 382–443. As for the costs of war with the Visconti, note the letter which Urban wrote Louis the Great of Hungary and Casimir III of Poland (on 27 June, 1363), asking them to assist in the collection of a three years' tithe which he had imposed upon their kingdoms because of the heavy burden of expense under which the Church was laboring "especially on account of Bernabò Visconti" (Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 505–6, p. 67, and cf. nos. 508–12, 535, 547, *et alibi*). Bernabò finally accepted peace with the Holy See on 20 January, 1364, and a month later Urban expressed satisfaction in the Milanese lord's reconciliation with the Church (*ibid.*, no. 823, p. 120, dated 20 February, and cf. nos. 826, 846, and 982). Although Bernabò held almost a dozen important fortresses in the Bolognese until peace was made, the city of Bologna itself was in Alborno's hands.

¹¹¹ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 107–110. Following the traditional account, Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon* (1949), pp. 233–38, believes that it was a great mistake for Urban V to make peace with Bernabò Visconti, because Cardinal Alborno had him on the run, to which point of view Smet, *op. cit.*, pp. 213–17, takes interesting exception. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 206–28, sketches the background of events, and gives Mézières most of the credit for the peace of 1363–1364.

¹¹² Albano Sorbelli, ed., *Corpus chronicorum bononiensium*, in the new Muratori, *RIS*, XVIII, pt. 1, vol. III (1916–39), pp. 162–63, where the author of "Cronaca A" states that the French and Cypriote envoys were sent by their lords "perchè voleano fare lo passazo al Sepolcro," and, *ibid.*, pp. 179–83. The Cron. Villola says of Pierre Thomas "chè lla soa persona molto valse a far questa paxe," but then adds "e grande afano ne durò."

¹¹³ Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus*, II, doc. CCCLXXXVII, pp. 412–13.

¹¹⁴ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 458–61, pp. 60–61. Pietro Raccanelli or Recanelli was probably the outstanding *mahonese* of Chios. He was already captain of Smyrna when on 25 October, 1361, the Venetian Senate rejected the proposal for his marriage with Fiorenza Sanudo, heiress of Duke Giovanni I of the Archipelago (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 30, fols. 30^v–31^r). Naxos was not to fall to a Genoese, if the Venetians could help it, nor for that matter to a Florentine: A year later, on 27 December, 1362, by which time Duke Giovanni was dead, the Senate also put a stop to the efforts of Giovanni Acciajuoli, archbishop of Patras (Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 394), to marry Fiorenza to his brother Nerio, who was to become the duke of Athens in later years (Misti, Reg. 30, fols. 122^v–123^v).

¹¹⁵ Michel Hayez *et al.*, eds., *Urbain V (1362–1370), Lettres communes*, II, fasc. 2 (Paris, 1965), no. 5784, p. 107, and on Pietro da Fano, note Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1914), pp. 526, 570, and see especially Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, VIII (1932), 8, 66, 102–3, 124, 194, 233.

ready for the *passagium generale* which was to set out for the Holy Land in less than two years (on 1 March, 1365). The king of France was to be captain-general of the expedition, they were all told, and the king of Cyprus would go also, and so would many other nobles, for they had all taken the cross and had given their solemn word to fight the infidels overseas.¹¹⁶ But as Urban wrote the Doge Lorenzo Celsi, the king of Cyprus was going before the general expedition of all the crusaders. He would be the "magnificent precursor."¹¹⁷

The mercenary companies in the Midi remained a danger and an exasperation to the Curia, and on 25 May (1363) Urban V addressed an appeal to them also, "to the captains and all the personnel of whatsoever companies have established themselves in the kingdom of France and in neighboring regions." He reminded them that "both the perfidious Saracens and those cruel pagans commonly called Turks, who live in the East close to Christian peoples . . . , have invaded the lands of the faithful with such force and audacity that none or few can resist them." The Turks had overrun Christian Armenia. They had occupied various provinces, islands, cities, and castles, profaned sanctuaries, slaughtered Christians, enslaved them, and put them on the block for sale as though they were cattle. But now these infidels had themselves been weakened by plague and internecine discord, and ever since Peter, the illustrious king of Cyprus, had taken from them the seaport of "Satalia" (Adalia), terror had descended upon them. Peter had not shunned the perils of long journeys to the centers of authority in Europe to explain to the pope and the princes that now the power of the infidels could at long last be crushed. The Holy Land could be recovered.

Pierre Thomas, the archbishop of Crete and eastern legate of the Apostolic See, had affirmed the accuracy of the Cypriote king's assessment of conditions in the Levant. Urban had therefore proclaimed the crusade. The usual indulgence and privilege would be accorded to all who joined

the forces going overseas. The members of the free companies had the most dreadful need of absolution, and so they should respond promptly to his call to arms "in a spirit of devotion and union" to expiate the crimes they had committed against God, ecclesiastics, and the innocent. They were skilled in the exercise of arms, and should seek forgiveness in a service acceptable to God. They could acquire and possess the Holy Land forever, and so in this life they might seize the wealth of the enemies of Christendom, and by mending their ways also earn eternal wealth in the life to come. Urban thus summoned them to have a care for their own salvation, to cease pillaging Christians, and to help win back the land of the Savior's birth. He also informed them that he was sending the Augustinian friar Nicole de Brohom to go among them, instruct them further, and grant absolution to those who took the cross.¹¹⁸

Perhaps Nicole de Brohom's task was not as absurdly difficult as it might at first seem, for Peter's appearance in the south of France had aroused widespread interest. He was famous, an object of universal admiration, and some *routiers* had apparently expressed the desire to serve with him in the East. Since, when he was leaving Avignon, Peter seemed to be eager to get started on the crusade (and John II could not set out before the scheduled date), Pope Urban granted the impatient Cypriote the right to enroll in his service and send into the Levant 200 French nobles, 2,000 horse, and 6,000 foot "from other parts of the world," as well as *routiers* from the free companies and any other recruits he could gather from the ecclesiastical provinces of Aquileia, Grado, and Salzburg, the kingdoms of Hungary and Cyprus, the areas of Sicily, Dalmatia, and Greece.¹¹⁹ With the slackening of military employment in Italy during the coming months, especially after Bernabò Visconti made peace with the pope, English mercenaries in the peninsula also requested and received full assurance of the crusading indulgence for any and all of their company who would be willing to cross the sea and fight "for the recovery of the Holy Land."¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 476–85, pp. 62–63, dated 25 May, 1363. A letter was also addressed to Louis the Great of Hungary, enlisting his support for the crusade (*ibid.*, no. 486).

¹¹⁷ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1363, no. 23, vol. VII, p. 90; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 170–71; and note Reg. Aven. 155, fol. 241^v, dated 31 March, 1363, where Peter I is alluded to as "precursor intrepidus;" Mézières applies the word precursor to Peter as a title (*Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 106).

¹¹⁸ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 487, pp. 63–64, and on Nicole de Brohom, cf. Schäfer, *Ausgaben* (1937), pp. 19, 71, 141.

¹¹⁹ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, nos. 488–89, p. 65, dated 25 May, 1363.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, fasc. 1, nos. 891–92, 898–99, pp. 134–35, 137, dated 17 and 20 April, 1364; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 269–70.

Hopes for the crusade were still rising at the Curia when the news reached Avignon of King John's unexpected death in England (on 8 April, 1364), and in a letter of condolence to his son and successor Charles V, Urban lamented the terrible loss of his leadership.¹²¹ Although Charles lacked a crusading mentality, plans for the expedition continued, and indulgences were extended,¹²² but now more than ever Urban saw that everything depended on the young king of Cyprus, who had attended John's funeral in early May at Paris and S. Denis and Charles's coronation at Rheims about two weeks later.¹²³

In the meantime a spectacular event had occurred which threatened Peter I's hopes and plans for the crusade. In early August, 1363, a serious revolt broke out in the Venetian

¹²¹ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1, no. 924, p. 141, dated 30 April, 1364: "O quantus meror Christiani exercitus ad recuperationem Terre Sancte profecturi de proximo, cernentis se ducis tam providi tamque strenui amisisse ducatum!"

¹²² *Ibid.*, I, fasc. 2 (1906), no. 1033, p. 161.

¹²³ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 186–89. Peter I embarked thereafter on his long tour of eastern Europe, soliciting men and money for the crusade. He went to Germany, Bohemia, and Poland, where in Cracow (in late September, 1364) he found not only Casimir III but also Louis the Great of Hungary; thereafter he went to Austria, and through Carinthia back to Venice, where he arrived on 11 November, and where he spent more than seven months. Once more he stayed at the Ca Corner-Piscopia. It was upon this occasion that the bridge broke under the weight of the crowd which had gathered to greet him, and Peter emerged from the water with the reflection that now he had become a Venetian (*ibid.*, pp. 147, 200). On 22 June, 1365, honorary citizenship was bestowed upon his chancellor Mézières in the name of the Doge Lorenzo Celsi (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III [1883], bk. VII, no. 217, p. 41, and Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II [1852], 272–73).

Peter sailed from Venice on the morning of 27 June (. . . *rex Cipri, qui hodie mane recessit de Veneciis*), as the doge informed the captain of the Gulf, who was to keep a close watch on his movements (Mas Latrie, *op. cit.*, III [Paris, 1855], 751–52). Peter had sent Urban V word of his departure from Venice "cum copiosa comitiva pro Christi servitio bellatorum," and on 19 July Urban wrote to wish him godspeed (Raynaldus, *Ann. secl.*, ad ann. 1365, no. 18, vol. VII, pp. 119–20). After landing at Candia on the island of Crete and spending two months at Rhodes, where the Cypriote fleet was assembled, Peter set sail on 28 September for the Gulf of Adalia, and quickly thereafter (on 5–6 October) for Egypt, where on 10 October, 1365, he took Alexandria by storm. Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. Mas Latrie (1877), vv. 839–1691, pp. 26–52, has traced Peter's itinerary, with all the feasts and jousts along the way, from the coronation of Charles V to the two months' sojourn on Rhodes, on which see Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 189–201.

island of Crete.¹²⁴ Although the colonial policy of Venice was as a whole just and humane, it was also unyielding and exploitive. As the years passed, Venetian feudatories and Greek archontes tended to draw together and pursue their local interests, sometimes in opposition to the home government. Crete was far from Venice; it took a galley a month to make the trip. The serious disaffection of both Venetian colonists and Greek proprietors was shown by uprisings in 1332 and 1342,¹²⁵ an ominous prelude to the great revolt of 1363, when indignation and violence followed the imposition of a new tax to make repairs in the harbor of Candia. The Venetian families of Gradenigo, Venier, and Grimaldi, names long honored on the lagoon, joined with the Calergi in defiance of Leonardo Dandolo, duke of Candia, who insisted upon collection of the unpopular levy.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Collegio, Lettere Segrete (1363–1366), fols. 20^r ff., documents relating to the *rebellio commissa per nostros nobiles et universitatem Candide et aliorum locorum* (from the commission of the Venetian "ambassadors and provveditori" to be sent to Crete, dated 12 September, 1363): this register, the *Liber secretorum* [Collegii], which remains the major source of our information concerning the Cretan revolt, was once the possession of the Florentine senator, Marchese Gino Capponi, in whose library it was used by Louis de Mas Latrie; on 19 December, 1874, Capponi presented the volume to the Archivio di Stato in Venice, where J. Jegerlehner employed it for his article on "Der Aufstand der kandiotischen Ritterschaft gegen das Mutterland Venedig, 1363–65," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XII (1903), 78–125.

The caution and rigidity with which almost every detail of life was regulated by Venetian officials in the Cretan colony is illustrated by the documents published in Ernst Gerland, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Candia im Königlichen Staatsarchiv zu Venedig*, Strassburg, 1899, pp. 44–62, 66–82 (docs. mostly before the year 1360). Gerland also provides us with an analysis of the material in the Archivio del Duca di Candia in Venice. Documents more relevant for our present purpose may be found in Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II (1899, repr. 1965), 391–428. On the economic and social background, see J. Jegerlehner, "Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Kandias im XIV. Jahrhundert," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XIII (1904), 435–79. There is of course an account of the Cretan revolt in the old (but almost classic) work of Samuele Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, 10 vols., Venice, 1853–61, III, 217–27.

¹²⁵ Marino Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII (Milan, 1733), col. 607; Andrea Navagero, *Storia veneziana*, in *RISS*, XXIII (Milan, 1733), cols. 1025, 1031; F. Thiriet, "Sui Dissidi sorti tra il Comune di Venezia e i suoi feudatari di Creta nel Trecento," *Archivio storico italiano*, CXIV (1956), 699–712.

¹²⁶ Raffain Caresini, *Chronica*, ad ann. 1363, ed. Ester Pastorello, in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XII, pt. 2 (Bologna, 1922), 13–14; Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, col. 656; Navagero, *Storia veneziana*, in *RISS*, XXIII,

The rebels attacked the ducal palace in Candia, imprisoning the courageous Dandolo, who almost lost his life in the tumult. Venetian officials were killed, imprisoned, or expelled from the island. A prominent feudatory, Marco Gradenigo "the Elder," was made "governor and rector of Crete" (*gubernator et rector Crete*), and four colonists were appointed as an executive council to assist him in his duties. The rebels formed an army by releasing from prison criminals and debtors who were willing to exchange six months' military service for a pardon. The new government admitted Greeks to the grand council of the island and to the council of feudatories. S. Mark was deposed from his patronage of Crete, whose inhabitants now replaced him with their own countryman S. Titus. Restrictions were removed from the ordination of Greek priests, and there were those who would have substituted the Greek for the Latin rite in the cathedral church at Candia,¹²⁷ whose archbishop was of course none other than Pierre Thomas, who was then busy (as we have seen) with papal affairs at Avignon and in Italy. Although the Greeks and Latins got along badly together, and the Calergi looked toward the eventual liquidation of the Latin establishment in Crete, the tension and hostility between the allies gave little comfort to the statesmen of the Republic.¹²⁸

The Cretan revolt was known in Venice by 10 September (1363), and the government succeeded very quickly in isolating the rebels from the rest of Christendom, although adventurous Catalans were soon reported in various parts of the island. On 8 October the doge and his councillors wrote letters to the master of Rhodes,

cols. 1045E-47; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 229-30; and see in general Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II (1920, repr. 1964), 220-23, 607. Among the ten most prominent rebels condemned to death, for whom the Venetian government declared that no pardon was possible, three bore the name Gradenigo and two Venier (*Lettere segrete del Collegio* [1363-1366], fol. 61^v; Jegerlehner, "Der Aufstand der kandiotischen Ritterschaft," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XII, 89, 122).

¹²⁷ Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XII, 85, 101-7, from the *quaterni bannorum*, which were studied by Lorenzo de Monacis (chancellor of Crete from 1388 to 1429), *Chronicon*, ed. Flam. Cornelius, Venice, 1758, pp. 174-75 ff., and note Gerland, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Kandia*, pp. 3, 18, 31 ff. (on the registers of the *banna*), 43. The Republic's ecclesiastical policy in Crete is sketched in Giorgio Fedalto, "Le Sénat vénitien et les églises chrétiennes de Crète au XIV^e siècle," *Πρακτικά Γ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου*, II (Athens, 1973), 94-101.

¹²⁸ Sanudo, *op. cit.*, cols. 656-57; Navagero, *op. cit.*, col. 1047C.

Queen Eleonora of Cyprus, Prince John of Antioch (the regent of Cyprus during his brother Peter's absence), John V Palaeologus, and Andrea Querini, Venetian bailie in Constantinople. On 11 October they also wrote to Louis the Great of Hungary and Peter I of Cyprus, and thereafter to Joanna I of Naples, the Latin Emperor Robert, duke of Taranto and Achaea, and the legate Pierre Thomas. They sent an envoy to Genoa.¹²⁹ All recipients of the Venetian letters sent back reassuring replies, even the Genoese,¹³⁰ and on 15 October Pope Urban V wrote in paternal remonstrance to the rebels at Candia. He reminded them that they were by origin, culture, and privilege "in large part Venetian," and that they needed the motherland to defend them against schismatics and Moslems. If their rebellion should upset the crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land, on which the pope had set his heart, the universal Church would suffer

¹²⁹ *Lettere segrete del Collegio* (1363-1366), fols. 31^v-33^r. Genoa was close at hand, and required watching, "et etiam super dicto facto misimus lanuam unum nuntium nostrum . . ." (*ibid.*, fol. 32^r), and cf. Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XII, 111-12, who finds the word *unum* in this text "unleserlich." Incidentally, the envoy sent to Genoa was none other than Raffain Caresini, later chancellor of Venice (*Lettere segrete*, fol. 38^v). Caresini's name figures prominently in the diplomatic documents from about the middle of the 1340's.

The doge and his councillors had learned of the uprising "through the report of the skipper of an Anconitan vessel, who returned [*recessit*] from Candia on 10 September, as well as through letters from the castellans of Coron and Modon and our bailie and captain of Negroponte . . ." (*Lettere segrete*, fol. 29^r, dated 9 October, 1363, and addressed to the provveditori of Crete who were appointed on 12 September). The doge and his councillors had also learned "that in the area of Coron and Modon or Negroponte there is a certain George Scordilli, called 'Cazamumiri Grecus,' who is a noble and powerful, and sending him to the island [of Crete] might be a great boon to our interests, and therefore we inform you that we should think it expedient to have him thoroughly investigated, and when you have the report concerning him, if it still seems useful to you, to send him to persuade the other Greeks and look to our honor and the confusion of our enemies . . ." (*ibid.*, fols. 30^r-30^v, where the text which Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," p. 110, finds "unleserlich," is as follows: ". . . et propterea informamus vos quod utile putaremus quod faceretis de ipso persentiri et habita de eo noticia," etc.).

¹³⁰ As the Venetian government informed the castellans of Coron and Modon and the captain-general of the sea on 24 and 25 November (*Lettere segrete del Collegio* [1363-1366], fols. 39^r-40^r, and Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," pp. 88, 114-15). For the letter of the doge of Genoa, Gabriele Adorno, see Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II, 392, dated 9 November, and in general note Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 98, 101-5, 110-14.

a grave misfortune. Therefore he admonished and exhorted them to make peace with the Venetians, like faithful citizens and devoted sons of the Republic.¹³¹

In writing to Peter I of Cyprus on 11 October, the doge and his councillors (in the Collegio) had already indicated that, unless a quick victory could be assured, the Cretan rebellion might prove a grave impediment to his plans for the crusade.¹³² Peter answered from London on 24 November (1363), expressing his willingness to come to Venice as quickly as he could manage, and "with the select band of noble warriors whom we have gathered from diverse regions" to join with a Venetian force for the quick suppression of the Cretans' "mad temerity." At the same time Peter wrote his wife Eleonora and his brother John that the Cypriotes were not only to give the Cretans no aid, but they were to break off all relations with them, commercial and otherwise, until the rebellion had ended.¹³³

Peter had already informed the doge, in a letter dated at Calais on 20 October, of his success in recruiting crusaders from among the French and German nobles. He wanted to set

out from Venice the following March. Once again, therefore, on 29 November, the doge wrote him of the unsettling effect the sudden news of the Cretan revolt had had on Venetian plans to contribute to the success of the crusade. The Republic must now concentrate upon the recovery of the island. A fleet and an army were being put in readiness. So many ships, armed and unarmed, were needed for the transport of men, supplies, and equipment that the doge did not see "how our ships alone can suffice for these expeditions." But his government hoped for quick success in Crete, after which Peter would find the Venetians prompt and willing to do whatever they possibly could to assist the crusading cause.¹³⁴

The crusade would need Venetian galleys and transports, and Urban V was not at all mistaken in his fears. The Cretan rebellion did threaten the "general passage" against the Moslems. On 17 December (1363) the doge and his councillors wrote Urban that, notwithstanding the fact they had always treated the Venetian feudatories in Crete "as brothers and sons, born of the same parents and *patria*, enjoying with us the same honors and dignities," the said feudatories had revolted. Odious as this patricidal rebellion was, the Venetian government was no less disturbed because it was a serious obstacle to organizing the overseas expedition against the Moslems, for which the pope had made such promising plans. But now the Venetians had to prepare powerful naval and land forces to secure the recovery of Crete, and could in no wise furnish subsidies [of money and ships] as they had wished and intended to do. They hoped for a swift victory in Crete, however, and the pious sons of S. Mark were still anxious to work for the exaltation and extension of the Christian faith in the Levant.¹³⁵

¹³¹ Reg. Vat. 245, fol. 273: "Dilectis filiis populo civitatis Candiensis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem: . . . Cum itaque noviter ex relatione multorum percepimus inter dilectos filios nobilem virum ducem et commune Venetiarum et vos, qui ab eis pro magna parte, prout audivimus, originem suscepistis ac in civitate et privilegiis censebamini Veneti et soletis cum eis unanimiter in omnibus convenire, ortam esse discordiam. . . . Nosse quippe debet vestra discretio quanta mala possint vobis carentibus defensione magnifica Venetorum a finitimis scismaticis et infidelibus huiusmodi durante discordia evenire, quin immo eos qui vos solebant protegere offensores procul dubio sentiretis. . . . Ad hoc tamen adicitur vehementis doloris aculeus de generali provenientis incommodo quod ex vestra discordia, si ex ea turbaretur generale passagium per nos dudum pro recuperatione Terre Sancte indictum, ad quod prospere dirigendum totis mentis anelamus affectibus, universali ecclesie sequi posset. Quapropter universitatem vestram monemus et hortamur in domino per apostolica vobis scripta mandantes quatinus unitatem et pacem cum eisdem Venetis . . . sicut fideles concives et devoti filii celeriter reformetis. . . . Datum Avinione id. Octobris anno primo." On the same day Urban wrote the Doge Lorenzo Celsi, lamenting the uprising in Crete as an obstacle to the *generale passagium* against the Moslems and urging him to overcome the Cretan rebels "by clemency and kindness," *benignitatis mansuetudine* (*ibid.*, fols. 273^v–274^r). Lecacheux, I, fasc. I, nos. 663–64, does not give the text of these letters.

¹³² Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fols. 32^r–33^r, and Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, III, 742, with various unindicated deletions.

¹³³ Mas Latrie, II, 250–52; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 110–11, p. 23; Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II, no. 56, pp. 96–97.

¹³⁴ Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fol. 42^r, which was published with a few slips in transcription by Mas Latrie, III, 743.

¹³⁵ Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fol. 46^r: ". . . Et quamvis ipsa rebellio ex natura rei infesta nobis et gravis existat, non minus tamen nos turbat impedimentum notabile quod exinde proventurum cognoscimus ultramarino passagio per vestram Sanctitatem instituto. . . . Intenti ad recuperationem ipsius [insule Crete] pro qua potentes exercitus maritimum et terrestrem parari fecimus, exhibere nequaquam poterimus illa subsidia que singulariter optabamus passagio supradicto. . . ."

On 5 December, 1363, Urban V again reminded Louis the Great of Peter I's hopes for Hungarian assistance in the expedition which would try to recover the Holy Land the following spring (Wenzel, *Magyar diplomaciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta externa*, II

Meanwhile in Crete the insurgents had rejected Venetian offers to discuss their grievances, and had suggested no conditions of their own as possible bases upon which to restore peace and return the colony to its former allegiance. On 10 January (1364) the doge issued a commission to one Angelo Michiel to go to Turkey to purchase supplies.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, the Venetians now empowered their notary Desiderio Lucio to confer with Pierre Thomas and Philippe de Mézières (at the latter's request) concerning the eastward transport of the Cypriote king's crusaders. On 24 January Pierre and Philippe wrote the doge from Bologna that they expected to have about 1,000 crusaders (*equites de gentibus passagii*) ready to sail from Venice by the middle of March. Their letter was quickly delivered, and on the twenty-eighth the doge replied that his government was prepared to take this contingent to Crete "for the recovery of our island, so essential to the aforesaid crusade, and no more [than a thousand], because at present we do not have ships ready for a larger number." But the Cretan matter brooked no delay, and the doge wanted Pierre and Philippe to come to Venice as soon as possible to discuss the problem they all faced.¹³⁷

The Venetian notary Desiderio had, therefore, agreed that, if the crusaders would stop off at Crete long enough to help the Republic put down the Candiotte rebellion, their transportation would be provided to some further destination in the Levant. The Collegio was shocked by the notary's indiscretion, and on 28 January the doge wrote him:

We have received and considered the letter of the lord archbishop of Crete and of the chancellor of the lord

king of Cyprus as well as your own dated at Bologna on 24 January . . . , and having noted the tenor of your letter, we see quite clearly that you have extended yourself beyond the authority of your commission in giving them a full statement of [our available] galleys, horse-transporters, ships, and cogs, and you have even revealed to them the actions taken on the commissions of the provveditori whom we have sent to Crete both as to the justice to be done [there] and other matters which had all been ordered to be held in confidence. . . .¹³⁸

On 29 January (1364) the doge and members of the Collegio wrote Peter I that they had engaged a land army of 1,000 horse and 2,000 foot, and had the transports ready to take them all to Crete, but they were prepared to wait until the middle of March before setting out. If Amadeo VI, count of Savoy, and any other crusaders arrived in Venice before that date "in sufficient number with arms, horses, and equipment," the Venetians were prepared to take them to Crete, provided they would assist (according to the plan advanced by Pierre Thomas and Philippe de Mézières) in suppressing the Candiotte revolt. "After that, which we hope will be accomplished swiftly and easily, we shall arrange to transport them to Cyprus or anywhere else they may wish, for the aforesaid crusade [*passagium*]. . . ." Thereafter the same arrangements would be made for Peter and others, "and thus in the same way, and once for all, both your business and ours would get done."¹³⁹

Pierre Thomas and Philippe de Mézières came to Venice in early February (1364), as requested by the doge, but now they wanted the Signoria to carry 2,000 horse into the Levant, and apparently had to withdraw their offer to subdue the Candiotte rebels on the way. Philippe had received a letter from Peter I, written *manu sua propria*, which had shaken him badly and sent him running to Pierre Thomas for advice.¹⁴⁰ Peter now wanted passage for 2,000 horse (although the doge had stated flatly on 28 January that Venice could only transport a thousand at the most), and it would appear that he was no longer ready to spend on the island of Crete the time necessary to help subdue the rebels. Philippe has described the discussions, which

[1875], no. 439, pp. 599–600), and on the following day he asked the Doge Lorenzo Celsi to keep in mind the Venetian commitment to the crusade (Reg. Vat. 246, fol. 34), informing him that he was sending Pierre Thomas to help arrange peace (*ibid.*, fols. 34^v–35^r; Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl. veneto-levantinum*, II, 98). On 19 January, 1364, Urban replied to the (above) letter of 17 December from the doge, to the effect that he expected a solution to be found to the Candiotte crisis in the efforts of Pierre Thomas, and "speramus igitur in Deo, cuius negotium in prefato passagio agitur . . ." (Reg. Vat. 246, fol. 68, and with slight variations in Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl.*, II, 99). On Pierre Thomas's efforts to see that the rebellion in Crete should not divert the Venetians from their commitment to the crusade, see Smet, in his edition of Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas* (1954), pp. 218–21.

¹³⁶ Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fols. 57^r, 94^r; Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XII, 90, 118.

¹³⁷ Lettere segrete, fol. 64^v, partially published in Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, III, 745, note.

¹³⁸ Lettere segrete, fol. 64^v.

¹³⁹ Lettere segrete, fol. 60^v. Selections from this letter have been published by Mas Latrie, III, 744–45, and by Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," p. 119, with the wrong date (19 for 29 January).

¹⁴⁰ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 115.

lasted ten days, between Pierre Thomas and the four Venetian *savi* assigned to deal with the matter, but finally Peter I's emissaries got what they wanted.¹⁴¹

On 22 February the doge addressed a letter to Peter to inform him that "for the reverence due God and the Apostolic See and for the singular respect and love we have for you, we are happy to grant your request without any regard for our own well-known needs. . . ." Venetian ships would pick up 1,000 men with their horses, arms, and supplies in the area of Otranto before the middle of June (three months later than Peter's request) and transfer them without charge to the lands of the infidel. As for the other thousand, they could rent Venetian ships for their conveyance to the East, in which connection the government would give them advice and would secure them every possible advantage. Peter might also arm three or four galleys for his own passage and that of the barons who would be going with him.¹⁴²

The Venetians were astonished by their own generosity. Highly pleased with his countrymen, the Doge Lorenzo Celsi described the Venetian sojourn of Pierre Thomas and Philippe de Mézières in a long letter of 26 February to Urban V: ". . . Those laudable men—and truly laudable, and worthy of great commendation throughout the world, who have labored so fervently for this pious cause, and do not cease to labor indefatigably for it—they have described to us the zeal your Holiness has for proceeding with this sacred expedition. . . ." In the pope's name as well as in Peter's they had asked for the shipping to carry 2,000 horse into the Levant. The Venetians had been in a quandary; the island of Crete still awaited reconquest; but the claims of the crusaders were pressing. The Venetians would grant more than they were asked for; they would carry Peter's 2,000 men eastward, half of them with no charge at all for their passage (*gratis absque scilicet solutione nabuli alicuius*). The world should observe and emulate this example.¹⁴³

On 17 February, however, Peter I sent word from Paris that he realized to his great regret how

the Cretan revolt had made it impossible for the Venetians to furnish the galleys they had promised. In any event the count of Savoy and many other lords would not be ready to sail until August, by which time the Cretan revolt should be over, and a fleet should be available for the crusade.¹⁴⁴ Peter's letter was still unknown to his chancellor Mézières when on 26 March the latter wrote the count of Savoy from the Visconti court at Milan. Mézières had heard that the Savoyard departure had been postponed until September (*de quo multum doleo in visceribus cordis*). He inquired as to Amadeo's intentions now, and reproached him for this unpardonable delay in fulfilling his promise to set out on the crusade at the time agreed upon, for knights were descending upon Venice from all sides to follow the king of Cyprus to the Holy Land.¹⁴⁵ Urban V was doing his best, by letter after letter, to remove the English freebooters from Italy in order to employ their arms on an expedition against the Moslems in the Holy Land. At the same time he was trying to speed the eastward passage of Thomas Beauchamp (d. 1369), earl of Warwick, the wealthy William de la Pole, lord of Castle Ashby, Thomas de Ufford, son of the earl

¹⁴⁴ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 131, p. 27. The date of Peter I's letter has been troublesome. Mas Latrie, II, 252–53, note, refers to it as "datée seulement du 27 fév. et écrite probablement de Paris en 1364." Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 240, dates it 16 February, and states that "la lettre était datée de Paris probablement, et non de Padoue" [as Predelli, *loc. cit.*, suggests]. Iorga also states that it is dated 12 February in the *Historia de Venetia fino al 1382* by Gian Giacomo Caroldo, secretary of the Council of Ten and early sixteenth-century chronicler of Venice (cf. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II, 547), but Mas Latrie, III, 747, note, quotes Caroldo as giving the date 16 February, and so it appears in the extract of the pertinent passage from Caroldo, given by Mas Latrie in his "Nouvelles Preuves de l'histoire de Chypre," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXXIV (1873), 71–72. Smet, p. 220, note 18, and Boehlke, p. 245, note 32, both allude to the problem.

There has been no need for this confusion, however, for the date is fixed as 17 February and the place as Paris by a letter from the doge and members of the Collegio to their captain-general of the sea and provveditori in Crete ". . . de oblatione facta per nos domino regi Cipri circa factum passagii et de novis que habemus de ipso domino rege: nunc autem vobis denotamus quod nuper habuimus litteras ab ipso domino rege datas Parisius XVII Februarii per quas col[le]gimus ipsum non esse futurum Veneciis usque ad mensem Augusti proximi . . ." (Lettere segrete, fol. 90^v, dated 26 April, 1364).

¹⁴⁵ Iorga, "Une Collection de lettres de Philippe de Maizières: Notice sur le MS. 499 de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal [Paris]," in *Revue historique* XLIX (1892), 309–10, and *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 241–42.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 115–17; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 235–39.

¹⁴² Lettere segrete, fol. 71^v; Mas Latrie, III, 745–46.

¹⁴³ Lettere segrete, fol. 72^r; Mas Latrie, III, 746–47, in part; and cf. the letter of Pierre Thomas and Mézières to the king of Hungary, written in early March, 1364 (Wenzel, *Magyar diplomaciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta extera*, II [1875], no. 444, pp. 608–9).

of Suffolk, and two powerful French nobles who had also taken the cross.¹⁴⁶

No one knew better than the doge and his councillors how difficult it was to organize crusading expeditions. Within the past three centuries the Venetians had helped transport a good many of them into Levantine waters; they were ready to take Peter I and Amadeo VI eastward, but they were neither surprised nor disappointed by the postponement of the crusade. They could now set about the subjugation of Crete with fewer distractions. At the beginning of February, 1364, the notary Raffain Caresini, acting for the doge and commune of Venice, had made a contract at Milan with Petrarch's friend, the Veronese condottiere Lucchino dal Verme, who agreed to assume command of the Republic's land forces. Dal Verme's expedition against Crete was supposed to set out about the middle of March.¹⁴⁷ He is said to have arrived in Venice on the third of the month, and at a ceremony in the ducal palace on the twenty-eighth he took the oath of office *ad evangelia sancta Dei*, whereupon he received his commission and the banner of the Evangelist from the hands of the Doge Lorenzo Celsi.¹⁴⁸ Thereafter events moved swiftly. After a grand review of the troops, the fleet sailed from Venice on 10 April, 1364, under the orders of Domenico Michiel of Santa Fosca, who had been raised to the rank of captain-general of the sea.¹⁴⁹ It carried the 1,000 horse and 2,000 foot who had been recruited in the Veneto, Tuscany,

Dalmatia, and beyond the Alps,¹⁵⁰ to the northern coast of Crete, where on 6–7 May they disembarked at Frascchia, about a half-dozen miles or so from Candia.¹⁵¹

Meanwhile the uneasy alliance between the Greeks and Latins, always subject to hostility engendered by the ethnic and religious differences between them, had given way to dissension which had made much easier the task of dal Verme's troops. The native Greeks and archontes, incited by Zanachi Calergi, who aspired to hegemony over the entire island, had attacked Latin settlements, and killed a good many of the Venetian rebels, Corneri, Gritti, and Venieri. An attempt to assassinate the insurgent Duke Marco Gradenigo the Elder failed, and the chief conspirator was summarily dealt with by defenestration. But since all Venetian overtures had been rejected, and some of the rebels were making appeals to Genoa, dal Verme's troops went into action, of which little was needed, for after some initial bloodshed Candia surrendered on 10 May, and Retimo and Canea soon followed suit.¹⁵²

The duke of Crete, Leonardo Dandolo, was released from prison. Gradenigo the Elder was beheaded in the public square of Candia, and the Republic showed no mercy to the other leaders of the revolt, placing a price on their heads, many of which were delivered, for the rewards posted, as gory bundles to the authorities by the peasants, who in Crete have always been good at this game. Some of the lesser rebels were exiled. The Venetian government confiscated the property of the

¹⁴⁶ Wm. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow, eds., *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, IV (London, 1902), 8–11, letters dated from 13 April to 30 June, 1364.

¹⁴⁷ *Lettere segrete*, fols. 66^v–69^r, 71^r, and Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 129, pp. 26–27; Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl. veneto-levantinum*, II, 395–97.

¹⁴⁸ *Lettere segrete*, fols. 79^r–80^r; Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," p. 125.

¹⁴⁹ *Lettere segrete*, fols. 35^r–36^r, 36^v, 37^r, 39^r, 40 (relating to Michiel), 84 ff. As for the size of the fleet, Raffain Caresini, *Chronica*, in *RISS*, XII, pt. 2 (1922), 15, says that it contained "many galleys and nine horse-transport open at the stern," but on 10 March, 1364, the doge and members of the Collegio wrote the bailie and councillors of Negroponte, "... Ad recuperationem insule nostre Crete et extermin[i]um rebellium nostrorum ad partes illas mittimus potentem exercitum maritimum et ter[re]stre[m], viz. mille equitum et II m. peditum electorum, pro quibus transducendis cum hedificiis et aliis oportunis parari fecimus et armari XX usserios [horse-transport] et VIII magnas naves ..." (*Lettere segrete*, fol. 76^v, and note fol. 86^v). On 2 April they considered the possible necessity of adding small vessels (*griparie et alie naves minute*) for use in putting men ashore (*ibid.*, fol. 84^r).

¹⁵⁰ *Lettere segrete*, fol. 42^v, and cf. Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," p. 90; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 125, p. 25; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV (Zagreb, 1874), nos. CVII–CXI, pp. 59–64; Wenzel, *Magyar diplomacziak emlékek*, in *MHH, Acta externa*, II, no. 442, pp. 602–7, and esp. no. 445, p. 610, a letter to the ban of Dalmatia and Croatia, dated 29 April, 1364: "... Misimus enim cum dictis navigiis [contra Cretenses missis] soldados equestres et pedestres diversarum et plurium nationum, sicut sunt Alemani, Anglici, Hungari, Sclavi, Italici, et Ultramontani. ..." Some of these motley forces had landed (and plundered) in the area of Zara.

¹⁵¹ Sanudo, *op. cit.*, cols. 657–58; Navagero, *op. cit.*, cols. 1047–48; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 251.

¹⁵² Caresini, *Chronica*, in *RISS*, XII, pt. 2 (1922), 15; Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," pp. 93–94; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 251–52. In 1365 the duke and council of Crete ordained that victory celebrations should be held every year in Candia on 10 May, with a religious procession and horse racing, "... ipsa die post prandium ordinetur quoddam pallium, ad quod curratur cum equis ..." (Gerland, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Kandia*, pp. 119–20).

Gradenigo and Venier families, who continued the struggle with the Calergi under the leadership of Tito Venier. On 10 August they declared their fealty to the Byzantine Emperor John V, whom they must have embarrassed by the gesture, and announced themselves the champions of Greek Orthodoxy against Latin Catholicism. They withdrew into the mountains and laid waste most of the island in guerrilla warfare. The Cretan revolt was not entirely stamped out until the reign of the Doge Marco Corner (Cornaro), who succeeded Lorenzo Celsi in July, 1365, when the remaining leaders were finally executed (in April, 1366), and the island restored to the unpopular sovereignty of the Serenissima for three more uneasy centuries.¹⁵³

The victory over the Cretan insurgents became known in Venice on 4 June, 1364, when at mid-day Petrarch stood with his good friend Bartolommeo de' Papazzurri, archbishop of Patras (1363–1365), at the window of his house in Venice, very likely, as Sanudo says, the Palazzo Molina (now marked by a plaque) on the Riva degli Schiavoni, looking out over the Bacino.¹⁵⁴ Suddenly he saw, coming into the harbor, the garland-draped galley which was bringing home the news that the lion banner of S. Mark was flying again over every important fortress in Crete. On 12 June the doge and members of the Collegio approved the text of a congratulatory letter to Lucchino dal Verme, and a similar letter of appreciation was to go to Domenico Michiel.¹⁵⁵ On the thirteenth a letter announc-

ing the victory was sent to the Venetian bailie in Constantinople. He was to present it to the Emperor John V.¹⁵⁶

Couriers carried the news in all directions, and the doge received messages of congratulation from Urban V and his brother Anglic de Grimoard, then bishop of Avignon; Cardinals Androin de la Roche and Gil de Albornoz, apostolic legates in Italy; Louis the Great of Hungary; Joanna of Naples; Robert of Taranto, prince of Achaëa and titular Latin emperor of Constantinople; and the Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV.¹⁵⁷ The pope had received the news of the Venetian suppression of the revolt "cum immensa letitia cordis," and urged the doge and his people now to show their gratitude to God by increasing the support which they had already promised for the crusade.¹⁵⁸ In the meantime, on 16 June, the Maggior Consiglio voted dal Verme a lifetime pension of 1,000 gold ducats a year.¹⁵⁹ He arrived with his staff on the twenty-fifth, and the Venetians gave themselves over to prolonged celebration.

Petrarch has described the celebrations in a letter as well known to Sanudo as to Romanin (*Epistolae Seniles*, IV, 3, dated 10 August, 1364):¹⁶⁰

The most august city of the Venetians is today the home both of liberty and of peace and justice, sole refuge of the honorable, sole port which the ships of those who wish to live an upright life seek when they have been shaken by the ubiquitous storms of tyranny and war, city rich in gold but richer in fame, strong in her possessions but stronger in valor, built upon

¹⁵³ Caresini, *Chronica*, in *RISS*, XII, pt. 2 (1922), 15–17; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 168–75, 177–78, 182–85, 188, 190–93; Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl. veneto-levantinum*, II, 401 ff.; Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS* XXII (1733), cols. 658–60, 663; Navagero, *Storia veneziana*, in *RISS*, XXIII, cols. 1047–50; Jegerlehner, "Aufstand," pp. 94–97; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 252–53. Since some of the Cretan rebels had fled to the island of Rhodes, the doge and members of the Collegio wrote the new master of the Hospital, Raymond Béranger, on 17 October, 1365, that his predecessor Roger des Pins (d. 28 May, 1365) would not tolerate their presence on the island, and they requested Raymond also to forbid them refuge and residence in any area subject to the Hospitallers (Lettere segrete, fol. 171^r).

¹⁵⁴ *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, 659C: "Di questi trionfi fatti in Venezia per la ricuperazione dell' Isola di Creta, si truova un' epistola di Messer Francesco Petrarca poeta, il quale era in Venezia, e stava in Casa da Molino delle due Torri sopra Canalgrande a San Giovanni Bragola, dove al presente è fatta parte del Monastero di San Sepolcro."

¹⁵⁵ Lettere segrete, fol. 98^r: "Receptis novis de felici victoria habita de insula Crete: Domino Luchino de Verme. . . Nobilitatis vestre litteras et provisorum nostrorum felices progressus nostros et gentium nostrarum

contra rebelles et proditores nostros Crete et de recuperatione civitatis nostre Candide inter cetera continentes leto animo suscepimus. . . ." Much the same letter went to Michiel. The letters were sent in duplicate (*replicate per barcham*), to be certain of their reaching dal Verme and Michiel.

¹⁵⁶ Lettere segrete, fol. 99^r.

¹⁵⁷ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 155, 159, 160–64, 198; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CXXIV, p. 73; Wenzel, *Magyar diplomaciai emlékek*, in *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 453, p. 616, letter of Louis the Great, dated 26 June, 1364; and see especially Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl. veneto-levantinum*, II, 397–400.

¹⁵⁸ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 2 (1906), no. 1045, p. 163; text in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1364, no. 9, vol. VII (Lucca, 1752), p. 97, and in Thomas and Predelli, *Dipl. veneto-levantinum*, II, no. 61, p. 104.

¹⁵⁹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 158, p. 31; the text may be found in Sp. M. Theotokes, 'Αποφάσεις Μείζονος Συμβουλίου Βενετίας, Athens, 1933, *Liber Novella*, no. 10, p. 142 (Μνημεία τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας, vol. I, pt. 2).

¹⁶⁰ Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, III (1855), 225–26.

a solid foundation of marble, but set upon the even more solid foundation of civil concord, girt about with the salt sea, but securer in the salt of her wisdom. You should not believe that Venice was exalted and joyous over the recovery of the island of Crete, which, however prodigious the feat might appear because of the island's ancient renown, is still a small achievement for these prodigious spirits. All things, although they may appear very great, are small in comparison with enduring courage. The outcome has been as it should be, of course, but Venice exults not in her own victory but in that of justice. For why was it a great achievement for a bold and powerful people, with such a doge and with such commanders on land and on sea, to have conquered these poor unequipped little Greeks [*inermes Graeculi*] and to have overcome the wickedness of deserters? The great achievement is that even now in our time fraud yields so quickly to fortitude, and vices succumb to virtues, and God still cares and has regard for the affairs of men. . . .¹⁶¹

It would take a long time to describe in words the whole course of their solemn celebration, and my busy and humble pen is not up to it. Hear a summary of what happened. When on 4 June of this year 1364, at about noontime [*hora ferme diei sexta*],¹⁶² I happened to be standing at my window, looking out upon the high sea, and there was with me he who was my brother once, but is now my most beloved father, the archbishop of Patras, who, intending to go in early autumn to his see, is spending this summer here in my—rather in his own—house, because by the goodness of fortune our affection for each other has remained unchanged, suddenly one of the long ships which they call galleys, decked out in a garland of green branches, entered the mouth of the harbor, under oars, interrupting our conversation by the unexpected sight which it afforded. Instantly we began to assume that the ship was bringing some good news. The sails were trimmed; the sailors struck

the water with zest [as they rowed]; the young men were crowned with garlands, and their faces were gladsome; with standards raised on high from the prow of the ship they saluted the city, victorious, but still without knowledge of the fact. Already the watchman in the highest tower had given the signal, and had announced the coming of a ship from afar, and so a crowd had gathered from all the city, down by the shore, not because of anyone's command, but merely from the desire to learn what all this meant.

When at length the ship had got nearer, and everything came into view, we observed the enemy's standards hanging from the stern, and there no longer remained any doubt but that the ship was the messenger of victory. Not yet, however, did we hope for victory in the war, but in some battle or other, or some city captured, and our spirits did not seize upon the meaning of all this. But when the messengers had landed and had spoken in the Council, there was joy beyond all hope and expectation. The enemy had been beaten, cut to pieces, captured, and put to flight; our citizens had been released from their chains; the [island] cities had returned to their obedience; the yoke had been reimposed upon Crete; our victorious arms had been laid down; at last the war was over without slaughter, and peace had been gained with glory. When he had learned these things, the Doge Lorenzo Celsi, a man (unless perchance my love of him deceives me) of real greatness of mind and suavity of manner, and above all notable for his singular piety and love of country, knowing that nothing was properly, nothing happily, done unless it drew its inspiration from religious observance, turned to praise of God and to expressions of thanksgiving with the entire people.

Throughout all the city but especially in the basilica of S. Mark the Evangelist—and in my opinion nothing more beautiful than this church has anywhere been built—it is as much as can be built by man for God—sacred celebrations and a splendid procession were held before and around the church [in the Piazza S. Marco], where not only the people and all the clergy were present, but foreign prelates also, whom some chance or curiosity or the common devotion held in the square. . . .

Petrarch goes on to describe the games, races, and jousts held in the Piazza, which despite the heat of the afternoon were witnessed by a vast throng of men and women, young and old, rich and poor. The doge himself occupied the stand over the central portal of the church, "the place where those four gilded bronze horses stand, of ancient and marvelous workmanship." Petrarch had been invited to attend the festivities, which he did; he was seated at the doge's right, but two days of watching such spectacles were enough for him. He excused himself, and returned to his literary pursuits, which he modestly describes as being "known to everyone" (*occupatio*

¹⁶¹ Petrarch's apostrophe to Venice should be compared with Pope Pius II's scathing denunciation a century later, in the *Commentarii*, XI, ed. Giuseppe Cugnoni, *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini Senensis qui postea fuit Pius II Pont. Max. opera inedita* . . . , in the *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, CCLXXX (1882–83), 3rd ser., *Memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, VIII (Rome, 1883), 541–43, and cf. the translation by Florence A. Gragg, *The Commentaries of Pius II*, in *Smith College Studies in History*, XLIII (1957), 743–46 (these passages being almost entirely omitted from the Frankfurt edition of 1614, at p. 299).

¹⁶² Petrarch is obviously reckoning time according to the old fashion, which divided day and night into two sets of twelve hours, the length of which varied with the season. From the middle of the fourteenth century, however, the Italians usually divided the "day" into twenty-four hours, the first hour beginning between 9 and 10 P.M. in June and July (and between 5 and 6 P.M. in December and January), a fact which should always be kept in mind in reading the diplomatic correspondence from Petrarch's later years until after the end of the period covered in the present work (see B. M. Lersch, *Einleitung in die Chronologie*, 2 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899, I, 8–10).

nulli incognita).¹⁶³ At any rate the Venetian victory over the Cretan rebels was soon "known to everyone," at least to everyone in the capitals of Christendom.

¹⁶³ *Opera Francisci Petrarcae Florentini*, 2 vols., Basel, 1554, II, 864–67, dated "Venetiis IIII Idus Augusti."

12. THE SACK OF ALEXANDRIA AND THE RESTORATION OF PEACE WITH EGYPT (1365–1370)

THE fall of Candia and the reduction of Crete, which was proceeding well, obviously freed Venetian galleys and transports for service in the coming crusade. The time had come to ask the Doge Lorenzo Celsi to repeat the extraordinary offer he had made in February, 1364, at the height of the Candiot crisis, to carry into the Levant half a crusading expedition of 2,000 men with their horses, arms, and supplies at the Republic's own expense. On 5 July (1364) the indefatigable Pierre Thomas was appointed to the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople, which for the past half-century had brought with it the revenues and jurisdiction of the bishopric of Negroponte.¹ Like Peter I of Cyprus, Pierre Thomas was becoming a personification of the crusade, and the reason for his new appointment was soon made clear.

Although Cardinal Talleyrand of Périgord had died six months before (on 17 January), no nomination had yet been made to the crusading legation. Urban V may have felt that there was little need for an eastern legate until the Cretan war was over, but now, on 10 July, he appointed Pierre Thomas as Talleyrand's successor. Peter I of Cyprus was lauded in the bull of appointment as the "athlete of Christ and intrepid precursor" of the crusade, and the coming 1 March (1365) was fixed as the date of departure for those who had already taken the cross and for those who were still to do so. Urban lavished praise upon Pierre Thomas as a man "very much after our own heart" (*utique secundum cor nostrum*), and Pierre received the extensive faculties sometimes accorded crusading legates in the East. He could authorize preachers to seek recruits for the *passagium* by granting the usual indulgences over wide areas, including Salzburg in Austria; Gran in Hungary; Grado and Aquileia in Friuli; Capo d'Istria and the chief cities in Dalmatia; Palermo, Messina, and Monreale in Sicily;

Lepanto, Patras, and Corinth; Athens, Thebes, and Neopatras in Catalan territory; the islands of Corfu, Naxos, Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus; Pera in Constantinople; Caffa on the Black Sea; and elsewhere.² By this time no one at the Curia Romana could doubt either the sincerity of Urban's decision or the intensity of Pierre Thomas's desire to launch an effective crusade against the infidel.

The prospect of a large-scale expedition against the Turks, if it was to be against the Turks, should have been more exciting in

² Reg. Aven. 156, fols. 45^r–46^r, 52; Reg. Vat. 253, fols. 27, 31^v–32^r; Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 271^r–276^r; Paul Lecacheux, ed., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V (1362–1370) se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 2 (1906), no. 1080, pp. 169–70; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1364, no. 24, vol. VII (vol. XXVI of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1752), pp. 106–7, gives a partial text of the bull of 10 July; Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Joachim Smet, Rome, 1954, pp. 117–19; F. J. Boehlke, Jr., *Pierre de Thomas, Scholar, Diplomat, and Crusader*, Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 248–51. The faculties and privileges granted Pierre Thomas are delineated in Reg. Aven. 156, fols. 46^r ff.; Reg. Aven. 157, fols. 111^r ff.; Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 273^r ff., 283^r ff. (in Lecacheux, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1081–84, p. 170); Reg. Vat. 253, fols. 28^r–29^r, 30^v–34^r; and Reg. Vat. 261, fols. 86^r ff. He was allowed eight notaries on his staff, *octo clerici non coniugati nec in sacris ordinibus constituti*, who were each to take an oath of fealty to the Holy See (Reg. Aven. 157, fol. 111^v).

Urban V had decided to appoint Pierre Thomas to the crusading legation as early as May (1364), for the original archival text of the bull of nomination was first addressed to Pierre as archbishop of Crete and bore the date *XVI Kal. Junii* (17 May). This date was changed thereafter to *VI Idus Julii* (10 July) when Pierre is addressed as patriarch of Constantinople (Reg. Aven. 156, fols. 45^r, 46^r and ff., with similar alterations of date and title in Reg. Aven. 157, fols. 111^r–112^r). As Boehlke suggests, apparently Urban had appointed Pierre to the legatine mission before he decided to make him patriarch of Constantinople.

Although Pierre's appointment as patriarch is dated 5 July, papal letters dated 30 June are given in Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 241^v–242^v (cf. Lecacheux, I, fasc. 2, nos. 1051–53, pp. 163–64), addressed to Peter I of Cyprus, the Doge Lorenzo Celsi, Amadeo VI of Savoy, Earl Thomas [misnamed William] of Warwick, the master and Hospital of S. John, the Doge Gabriele Adorno and commune of Genoa, and the podestà and commune of Pera, notifying them of the appointment of "venerabilis frater noster Petrus patriarcha Constantinopolitanus, Apostolice Sedis legatus, . . . in favorem et fulcimentum generalis passagii. . . ." Pierre's new dignity entitled him to procurations of ten gold florins a day (Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 274^r, 275^r, *et alibi*), on which fact Mézières, *loc. cit.*, comments with obvious satisfaction.

¹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Aven. 156, fol. 120; C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 206. On the same date Pierre Thomas also received his former see of Coron in commendam (Reg. Aven. 156, fol. 103, and cf. Eubel, I, 212, and D. Rattinger, "Der Liber Provisionum praelatorum Urbani V," in *Hist. Jahrbuch d. Görres-Gesellschaft*, XV [1894], 64, 66–67).

Constantinople than in the West, but the learned Demetrius Cydones was not unduly moved as he sat down to write a long-delayed letter to his friend Simon Atumano, the Greek bishop of Gerace in southern Italy. Simon had written Cydones from Avignon, giving him the recent news and telling him of his own expected translation from the see of Gerace to that of Cassano. Cydones now answered that Simon's elevation was evidence of Pope Urban's good judgment, and that Simon's successes did honor to all Greeks. Simon had also suggested, however, that another embassy be sent from Constantinople to the West to appeal for aid against the Turks.

But alas, Cydones replied, our appeals to the Latins have become proverbial for their futility. One might as well expect the antipodes to help us as to wait for the Franks to do so. It had come to such a pass that even the Turks now asked with derision "whether anyone had further word of the crusade" (*εἰ τίς τι λέγειν ἔχει περὶ τοῦ πασσαγίου*). Another embassy to the West seemed quite useless. After all, one could hardly forget the promised galleys of Paulus of Smyrna and, later on, those of the legate [Pierre Thomas], and papal efforts had produced nothing more than a mass of letters and pompous diplomatic exchanges. Just look at what the king of Cyprus was getting for all his trouble. He had not sought aid by sending ambassadors to the West—he had gone in person to appeal to his co-religionists and fellow Latins. Apparently he assumed that he at least would not fail to get what he needed. But now he ran the risk of returning to Cyprus disappointed in his hopes, having gained nothing from his long venture abroad except the reputation of being "a romantic spendthrift" (*ἀναλωτικός τις καὶ μεγαλόψυχος*). His absence in Europe had been so far from frightening his enemies as to encourage them, for all the money he had been spending abroad might have been used to call others into the field to oppose them.³

If Cydones was no longer interested in the crusade, his emperor was, and on 16 October, 1364, Pope Urban acknowledged receipt of a

letter from John V in which the latter offered with "liberal magnificence" to assist in the recovery of the Holy Land. Michele Malaspina, a Genoese, had brought the imperial letter to the Curia, and had dilated orally upon the emperor's offer. Michele was now prepared to take the papal answer back to Constantinople: Urban merely asked John to give his support to the crusaders when they should reach his lands, and said that he prayed for the Greeks' liberation from Turkish attacks. He did not fail to urge upon John the schismatic Greeks' return to the Apostolic Church, but he also stated that he would commend both John and his subjects to the papal legate [Pierre Thomas] and to the captain-general of the crusading forces, upon whose appointment he had not yet decided.⁴ Cydones was almost wrong about the crusade, for two great expeditions were actually in the offing. The first would strike at the Moslems in Egypt; the second would rescue John V himself from an embarrassing predicament; but it is true that neither would impede the westward advance of the Ottoman Turks.

The first of these two expeditions owed its origin and its so-called success quite as much to the efforts of Peter I of Cyprus and his chancellor Philippe de Mézières as to the pope and his remarkable legate. But Philippe's laudatory biography of Pierre Thomas as well as the surviving documents inevitably fasten much of our attention on the Carmelite teacher and preacher, who now stood at the pinnacle of his career. Master of sacred theology of the University of Paris, papal envoy to Milan and Naples, Serbia and Hungary, Venice, Genoa, and Constantinople, humble pilgrim to Jerusalem, legate *a latere* in the East, Pierre Thomas was one of the most distinguished churchmen and devout crusaders of the fourteenth century. Born a peasant's son in the county of Périgord, he had become a trusted and skillful diplomat. Intelligence, integrity, and personality had carried him far, and he spent the last dozen years of his life dealing with popes and emperors, princes and doges, cardinals, bishops, statesmen, and soldiers. As we have seen, he crowned Peter I king of Jerusalem in the cathedral of Famagusta on Easter Sunday of 1360. From his first appointment in 1359 to legatine authority, he had worked ceaselessly for the crusade which Peter I had dreamed of, and

³ R. J. Loenertz, ed., *Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance*, I (Città del Vaticano, 1956), bk. x, ep. 93, pp. 126–27 (Studi e testi, no. 186). It is clearly this passage which led Loenertz to date this letter to the summer of 1364. The text may also be found, with a French translation, in Giuseppe Cammelli's edition of Cydones' letters, Paris, 1930, ep. 13, pp. 31–32.

⁴ Lecacheux, I, fasc. 2, no. 1305, p. 211, and cf. no. 1703, p. 292.

John II of France had promised to lead, a crusade which should either push back the Turks or recover the Holy Land. Everyone knew that peace among the Latin states was essential to the crusade, and the ever-ready Pierre Thomas, along with his admiring friend Mézières, had played an important part in bringing Bernabò Visconti to terms with the Holy See.

Now, as Pierre Thomas traveled from Avignon to Venice in July, 1364 (he went by way of Milan and Bologna),⁵ his hopes for the crusade were clouded by the threat of war between Cyprus and Genoa. Bloodshed among Genoese and Cypriote sailors in the harbor of Famagusta had soon involved the officials of both peoples, and the Genoese government seemed likely to make the most of this opportunity to settle some old scores with the Latin Cypriotes. Urban V worked strenuously to maintain peace in the Mediterranean, and inevitably Pierre Thomas's presence in northern Italy and his well-known diplomatic talents cast him yet again in the familiar role of peacemaker.

Peter I of Cyprus had finally returned to Venice from his European travels on 11 November (1364),⁶ and by a deed of procuration, given on 28 January (1365) in his bed-chamber at the Palazzo Corner-Piscopia on the Grand Canal, he named the papal legate Pierre

Thomas and the royal physician Guido da Bagnolo di Reggio as his envoys to seek peace with the Genoese. He was of course afraid lest war should force him to set aside the crusading plans he cherished as his chief ambition, "indeed almost driven," says the document, "by the visceral, fervent, and passionate desire which he has, to embark upon and carry through . . . the holy expedition. . . ." All through the winter of 1364-1365 the critical question of peace or war, crusade or no crusade, remained unanswered, and on 20 February Urban V addressed a letter to Pierre Thomas, "directing that you go to the city of Genoa without delay, and on our behalf work diligently for the said peace in accord with the prudence which God has given you. . . ."⁸

At length Pierre Thomas and the physician Guido da Reggio did succeed in reaching an agreement with the almost intractable Genoese on 18 April, on terms quite unfavorable to Peter I, who among other sweeping concessions had again to renew the old Cypriote-Genoese treaty of June, 1232 (by which his ancestor Henry I had granted the Genoese extensive extraterritorial rights).⁹ The Doge Gabriele Adorno and

⁵ See Smet's edition of Philippe de Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 119, note 34.

⁶ Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. Louis de Mas Latrie, Geneva, 1877, vv. 1536-53, pp. 47-48, 294, and cf. N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1896, pp. 199-200, 255, 259. On 26 October (1364), as Peter I moved south through Friuli (he was coming from Vienna), the Collegio had voted that ten nobles with two servants each should wait upon him at Conegliano, and the rectors of Conegliano, Treviso, and Mestre were each authorized to spend up to 300 pounds to do him "omnes civilitates et honores." The doge was to go as far as S. Secondo in the Bucentauro and conduct the king along the Grand Canal to the Corner palace near the Rialto (Mas Latrie, "Nouvelles Preuves de l'histoire de Chypre," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXXIV [1873], 73-74). This text may now be found reprinted with Mas Latrie's *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, 3 vols., Paris, 1852-61, repr. Famagusta: Éditions l'Oiseau, 1970, in the companion volume of *Nouvelles Preuves-Documents Nouveaux* (1970), pp. 65-66.

Upon his arrival in Venice, Peter I requested that another tournament be held to celebrate the Republic's victory in Crete, and it was of course on this occasion that he jousting with Lucchino dal Verme's young son in the Piazza San Marco (Iorga, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-60), not as part of the festivities witnessed by Petrarch in June, as erroneously stated by J. Jegerlehner, "Der Aufstand der kandiotischen Ritterschaft gegen das Mutterland Venedig, 1363-65," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XII (1903), 95.

⁷ *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, II (Turin, 1857), *Chartae*, no. CCXXXVIII, cols. 733-35 (in the *Historiae patriae monumenta*, IX); Carlo Pagano, *Delle Imprese e del dominio dei genovesi nella Grecia*, Genoa, 1852, pp. 295-98; with a highly abridged text in Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II (Paris, 1852), 253-54. The text of Peter I's act of procuration is preserved in the Genoese-Cypriote treaty of 18 April, 1365, on which see below.

⁸ Reg. Vat. 247, fol. 51^r, with letters of the same date to Peter I and to Gabriele Adorno, doge of Genoa (*ibid.*, fols. 50^r-52^r).

⁹ *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, II, cols. 732-43; Pagano, *Delle Imprese . . . dei genovesi*, pp. 294-307 (with the treaty of 10 June, 1232, *ibid.*, pp. 243-46); Mas Latrie, II, 254-66 (with the treaty of 1232, pp. 51-56), and cf., *ibid.*, III (1855), 747-49, from Arch. di Stato di Venezia, *Lettere segrete del Collegio* (1363-1366), fol. 133, dated 24 December, 1364, on Venetian efforts to make peace between Genoa and Cyprus.

Numerous papal letters as well as various other sources make clear the seriousness of the strife and bloodshed in Cyprus during the spring and summer of 1364, which almost led to war between the Genoese and the Latin Cypriotes, *orte dudum discordie inter dilectos filios officiales et incolas regni tui [Petri] ex una et cives lanuenses ex altera parte . . .* (Reg. Vat. 247, fols. 50^r ff., 67 ff.; Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 219 ff.; Lecacheux, I, fasc. 1 [1902], no. 1027, and fasc. 2 [1906], nos. 1034-35, 1102, 1602, 1609, 1619, 1649-50, 1681, presumably 1700, and finally 1724, dated 26 April, 1365, in which Urban V congratulates Peter I on the *concordia reformata* now obtaining between him and the Genoese).

On the origin and course of strife, see L. Machaeras, *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle'*,

the Anziani should have been pleased, and Pierre Thomas and Guido da Reggio had at least the satisfaction of informing the king, upon their return to Venice, that the Genoese would provide three armed galleys to serve in the Cypriote crusade. They also reported that the Genoese government was going to ask the pope to appoint the king captain of the whole enterprise. In a letter of 16 May Peter thanked Adorno and the Genoese council, his *amici carissimi*, for the galleys as well as for the proposal that he be made captain of the crusade, stating that he was also sending envoys to the Avignonese Curia to make the same request.¹⁰

Peter I had reached the lagoon three months later than he had written the doge would be the case. In the meantime crusaders of high estate had gathered in Venice, as Mézières informs us, "in sufficiently large numbers," and the Venetians were still prepared to stand by their promise to supply transport at half price. When the king did not appear in August, however, Pierre Thomas and Mézières saw that the wine from the crusading vineyard, which Pierre had planted with such labor, was turning into vinegar, "and the aforesaid nobles, waiting at Venice for the expedition to start, began to doubt that the king would come, and they departed in despair, abandoning the expedition." The Venetian government regarded itself as released from its obligation (and justly so, adds Mézières); the merchants who traded in the Levant rejoiced and mocked at the crusade.

When the king finally returned empty-handed from his peregrinations through the courts of Europe, he was thoroughly disheartened. Pierre Thomas, who derived strength from adversity, consoled him and urged him to put a strong hand to the plow and not look back. Peter rallied his few followers in Venice, and the legate apparently convinced him "that victory

lay not in a multitude of people, that courage came from heaven, . . . that God would aid the few on the crusade. . . ." But the trouble with Genoa now entered its critical phase, and there were months of further delay. At length, however,

the detractors of the crusade, seeing the king's preparations and the legate's firm resolve, were confounded and became quiet for a while: news flew to the Christian princes, inciting them to God's own war, but they continued to slumber as though drunk with wine; caring not a whit for the expedition, they gave no help; and they moved not a foot to join the king's crusade, which was now beginning, and which the supreme pontiff had proclaimed to the world.¹¹

Through May, 1365, Peter I, Pierre Thomas, and Philippe de Mézières worked hard to complete arrangements for the dispatch of the fleet from Venice, where French, English, and German crusaders had doubtless been conspicuous for some weeks on sightseeing tours of the churches and palaces in the fabulous city. About the first week in June, Peter sent ahead to Rhodes, according to Mézières, "many ships laden with armed men and about 500 horses." Although the rank and file of the crusaders certainly did not know that their objective was to be Alexandria in Egypt, and in the weeks to come both the Genoese and Venetians were to keep the movements of Peter's fleet under constant surveillance,¹² one wonders

ed. and trans. R. M. Dawkins, 2 vols., Oxford, 1932, I, bk. II, pars. 145–49, 153–56, pp. 126 ff.; René de Mas Latrie, ed., *Chroniques d'Amadi et de Strambaldi*, pt. I (Paris, 1891), 413–14, and esp. pt. II (1893), 56–58, 60–62; Mas Latrie, ed., *Chronique de l'île de Chypre par Florio Bustron*, in *Mélanges historiques*, V (Paris, 1886), 261–62; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 255–66; Smet's edition of Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 122–23, 222–24; and Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, pp. 258–66. In May, 1373, the Cypriotes gave Adalia back to the Turks for fear the Genoese might take it! (Machaeras, I, bk. III, pars. 366–69, pp. 344–48, and Amadi, pp. 441–42; Strambaldi, pp. 147–49; Florio Bustron, p. 296).

¹⁰ *Liber iurium*, II, col. 744; Pagano, *Delle Imprese*, pp. 293–94; Mas Latrie, II, 266–67; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 266.

¹¹ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 119–24. In answer to complaints which Urban V had made to the Venetian notary Raffain Caresini, who was then at the Curia in Avignon, with respect to the silence the Republic seemed to be maintaining "super facto unionis contra Turchos," the doge and members of the Collegio returned the protest that "complacuius domino regi Cipri pro transitu suo et plurium nobilium qui secum transfretarent de pluribus galeis et navigiis secundum promissionem per nos olim sibi factam pro reverentia Sanctitatis sue" (Lettere segrete, fol. 151^v, dated 27 May, 1365). This text sheds doubt on Mézières's statement that Peter I now gathered his followers "in expensis suis et sine adiutorio alicuius principis vel communitatis Christianorum" (*op. cit.*, p. 124).

¹² Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 266–67, 277–78; Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas*, p. 273. On 26 June, the day before Peter's own departure, the doge and Collegio wrote Niccolò Polani, commander of a galley in the Gulf, "Significamus vobis pro informatione vestra quod per nos et nostra consilia minus, Rogatorum [the Senate], et XL [the Quarantia] et additionis [the Giunta] captum est et sic mandamus capitaneo nostro Culphy quod tres ex galeis Culphy, de quarum numero esse debet galea vestra, assotientur [= associant, follow] dominum regem Cipri usque ad insulam suam Cipri vel usque Rodum vel usque Sataliam. . . ." (Lettere segrete del Collegio [1363–

whether Urban V did not know that Alexandria was to be the crusaders' target. Nevertheless, on the following 25 August, Urban conceded the Venetians a "grace" to send six ships (*naves*) with commercial cargoes (excluding arms, metals, and the usual contraband) to Alexandria and the other lands of the soldan of Egypt.¹³

But when the captain of the galleys of the (annual) Alexandrian run reached Candia, he was to consult the duke and council of Crete and the *provveditori* (and if necessary to summon the two Venetian consuls then in Alexandria) to see whether it was safe to go on to Egypt, "because at present no certain news has been forthcoming about the intention and decision of the lord king of Cyprus."¹⁴ Assuming that the Alexandrian galleys might be able to proceed to their destination, the council (*collegium*) of Venetians in the Mamluk port was authorized to submit disputes between Venetians and Egyptians to a Moslem judge or *cadi* or to some other local authority.¹⁵

The Senate was duly grateful for papal permis-

sion to send six "ships" (*naves*) to trade in Alexandria. But although the round ship carried a much larger cargo than the galley, the Senate reminded their agent in Avignon, the notary Desiderio Lucio, that for security on the distant Levantine run the Republic really needed a license to send galleys. Desiderio was therefore to solicit the aid of the bishop of Avignon and the archbishop of Toulouse and ask the pope for permission to send galleys to Egypt instead of "ships." He was to try to persuade the pope to substitute six galleys for each ship (or to get as many galleys as he could) and to have new letters of grace issued to that effect, expending whatever sum seemed necessary to secure the Republic's request.¹⁶ Desiderio enjoyed only moderate success, for when the new grace was forthcoming on 23 September (1365), Urban had limited it to eight galleys.¹⁷ It would be interesting to know whether or not Urban was aware of Peter I's "intention and decision" when he granted this license to trade in Alexandria.

If the Venetians did not know the destination of the crusading fleet, and it is clear that they did not, they probably entertained an accurate suspicion. Five years later (in 1370), after Peter's death, the statement was made in the Senate that he had failed to keep a promise which he had allegedly made before setting out, "not to go into Alexandria" until after the month of October (1365).¹⁸

1366], fol. 153^v): Follow Peter wherever he goes, to Cyprus, Rhodes, or Adalia. See also, *ibid.*, fols. 154^r, 154^v, 155^r, 157^r, 159^r, letters dated 26–27 June, to the captain of the Gulf, and to the duke, councillors, and *provveditori* of Crete, three of these letters being given, with an occasional omission and misreading, in Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, III, 751–52.

¹³ R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, III (Venice, 1883), bk. VII, no. 227, p. 42. On 4 September (1365) the Venetian Senate commended their notary Desiderio Lucio, who was then in Avignon, for his part in procuring the "grace" (dated 25 August, but granted by Urban V a week or so earlier): Desiderio was to request an audience with the pope, "et eidem exponas qualiter nuper intellecta per litteras tuas [datas Avinione 17, 20, 21 et 22 mensis Augusti] inter cetera de liberali gratia sex navium per Sanctitatem suam nobis concessa maximam consolationem recepimus" (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 111^v).

On 28 August, before news of this grace had reached Venice, the Senate had voted that, since the date set for the departure of the "galleys of Cyprus and Alexandria" (two different fleets) had already been postponed from Thursday, 4 September, to Saturday, the sixth, the galleys must leave not later than Sunday night, the seventh, after which every galley would incur a penalty of 30 ducats a day for each day's delay, and there was to be no further postponement of the date of departure (Misti, Reg. 31, fols. 110^r, 111^r). On 4 September the Senate also voted to impose suitable penalties upon Venetian merchants who tried to defraud the Mamluk authorities of customs duties and other commercial levies (*ibid.*, fol. 111^v). The Venetian-Cretan merchant Emmanuele Piloti (born about 1371) acknowledges having cheated the Egyptian customs (Pierre-Herman Dopp, ed., *Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti sur le Passage en Terre Sainte* [1420], Louvain and Paris, 1958, pp. xx, 181).

¹⁴ Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 112^r.

¹⁵ Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 112^v.

¹⁶ Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 111^v, dated 4 September, 1365: "... quod gratia dictarum sex navium permittetur et transferratur nobis in galeis, procurando obtinere quem maiorem numerum galearum poteris et faciendo totum posse tuum quod ad minus quelibet navis permittetur in sex galeis, ut alias factum fuit."

¹⁷ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 234, p. 43. Annotations were later added to this document, recording that three galleys were sent to Beirut on 8 September, 1366 (not 1365, as stated by Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 277–78, note), and five more to Alexandria in 1371, thus making up the eight galleys allowed by the pope in this particular grace.

¹⁸ Misti, Reg. 33, fols. 77^r, 119^v, dated 29 September, 1370 (*die penultimo Septembris*), and 20 June, 1371, refs. from Mas Latrie, "Nouvelles Preuves," *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, XXXIV, 78–80: "Cum nobilis vir Ser Andreas Venerio, olim consul noster in Alexandria, et aliqui alii nostri nobiles et fideles tempore quo dominus rex Cipri cepit Alexandriam fuerint deraubati et damnificati per gentem armate domini regis predicti," the Venetian Senate voted to seek an indemnity (from the prince of Antioch and the queen of Cyprus) which Andrea Venier and the others had long been seeking, "specialiter attento quod dominus rex non servavit promissionem nobis per eum factam de non eundo in Alexandriam usque per totum mensis Octobris tunc temporis" (fol. 77^r).

On 25 June, as Peter I, the papal legate, and the Cypriote chancellor were about to set out for the Levant, the doge of Venice and members of the Collegio had urgent cause to write their notary Raffain Caresini, who was then on a mission to the Curia Romana at Avignon. Their letter throws some light on the shady background of Italian trade with the Moslem states. On 13 July, 1352, five months before he died, Pope Clement VI, whose nepotism was on the grand scale in keeping with his character, had granted his nephew Guillaume Roger de Beaufort, viscount of Turenne, and the latter's wife Eleanor the "faculty" or "grace" of sending overseas ten ships (*naves vel coquae*) and thirty galleys laden with whatever merchandise they chose, excepting of course the usual *prohibita* or contraband. The Venetians had purchased these rights from a certain Étienne de Batuto, a canon of Agen and an agent of the Roger family;¹⁹ they wanted the "grace" to send the ten ships and thirty galleys to the profitable lands of the Mamluks (*ad terras soldani*), especially Alexandria.

The Republic had agreed to pay the surprising sum of 12,000 ducats in installments, and had already paid 3,000 when Innocent VI had revoked "this and all other such graces." Subsequently the "lords of Tulle and Beaufort," presumably Laurent d'Albiars, bishop of Tulle, and Pierre Roger, known as the cardinal of Beaufort, had written the Venetian government, requesting payment of the balance due. Caresini, being at the Curia, had conveyed the Signoria's answer to their lordships: the Venetians could hardly be held accountable for such a debt, and in fact they had suffered a serious loss since they had sent out on the eastern trade only six galleys (and no ships), under the rights which they had purchased. In recompense, however, for the cancellation of the "faculty" for trade in the Levant, the lords of Tulle and Beaufort had secured from Innocent VI another "grace" of four ships (*naves*) for the viscount and viscountess of Turenne, and had been negotiating with Caresini for the sale of the new grace while giving him a quittance for the remainder due on the first one. The facts were said to be well known to both sides. Now, however, Guillaume Roger, the viscount, had come to Venice himself (he was going on the

crusade), "demanding of us 9,000 ducats as the balance of payment for the first grace."

The Collegio would not accede to his request, and wrote Caresini that they were prepared to submit the case to Urban V, which was quite agreeable to the viscount. The latter then calmly presented the vicar of the bishop of Castello (Venice) with an order to serve a summons upon the Venetian government, requiring that within forty-five days the Republic send a representative to appear in Avignon before the court of the curial judge or *auditor*, in whose name the citation had been issued. But since this was the first intimation the Venetians had received that a case might be pending against them at the Curia, the Collegio was indignant, and directed Caresini to remonstrate with the pope, his brother Anglic de Grimoard, bishop of Avignon, Geoffroy de Veyrols, archbishop of Toulouse, and any other members of the Curia who might seem appropriate, to halt action in the auditor's court. Since both Guillaume Roger and the Venetians had agreed to the pope's direct adjudication of the case, neither this auditor nor any other should interfere henceforth or seek to introduce gratuitous complications. The Collegio sent Caresini a copy of the original Venetian purchase of the grace and the auditor's letter of citation, and directed him to "maintain our rights and make such claims as shall seem best to you, and take care that the lord pope put an end to this business with the least possible loss to our state."²⁰

Peter I sailed from Venice with two galleys on the morning of 27 June, 1365, and within a few hours of his departure the doge and

¹⁹ Clement VI's grant of the unusually generous commercial "faculty" to his nephew Guillaume Roger and the latter's wife Eleanor is recorded in Reg. Vat. 146, fol. 34, with a summary in Déprez and Mollat, III, fasc. 5 (1959), no. 5359, p. 282, dated 13 July, 1352. The text of the Venetian government's letter to Raffain Caresini, dated 25 June, 1365, may be found in *Lettere segrete del Collegio*, fol. 156, and is published in Mas Latrie, III, 749-50. On 22 June, 1357, Guillaume Roger had ceded the faculty to Étienne de Batuto "in recompense for his services and under title of a donation" (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VI, no. 8, p. 277), a formula for relieving Guillaume of subsequent negotiations for sale of the faculty. (Étienne was a chamberlain of Pierre Roger, cardinal of Beaufort, later Pope Gregory XI.) The Venetians had acquired the faculty from Étienne in 1359, as shown by the documents summarized in Predelli, *Regesti*, III, bk. VI, nos. 109, 126, 157, pp. 297-98, 301, 305, and cf. W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, II (1886, repr. 1967), 47.

¹⁹ Cf. E. Déprez and G. Mollat, eds., *Clément VI (1342-1352): Lettres se rapportant à la France*, III, fasc. 5 (Paris, 1959), nos. 5338, 5346, 5392, pp. 279 ff.

members of the Collegio wrote the captain of the Gulf and the colonial government of Crete, ordering them to watch his every move and report back constantly on the places he landed at and on his apparent intentions.²¹ On 3 July they also wrote Jacopo Bragadin and his fellow commissioners (*provveditori*) in Crete that in the event Peter attacked

some place or places in Turkey . . . with which we have pacts, . . . you will send at once to the Turkish lord or lords in question such reassuring messages as may seem best to you, to excuse us and to give it to be understood that this is not [being done] with our approval or knowledge, and . . . like words may also be addressed to the Turks who are in our service at Crete. . . .²²

Philippe de Mézières says that Peter I paid from his own resources all the costs of the ships, sailors, and 600 men-at-arms, now sailing down the Adriatic, with the exception of a single galley which the Signoria of Venice had placed at his disposal. Favorable winds carried him, along with Pierre Thomas and Mézières himself, swiftly to Rhodes, where he received a royal welcome from Raymond Bérenger, the new master of the Hospitallers. Some months before, he had written his brother John of Lusignan, prince of Antioch and regent of Cyprus during his absence, to send the "army of his kingdom" to Rhodes, taking care that Cyprus should remain well protected. Mézières informs us that in due time (on 25 August according to Machaeras) sixty ships arrived in the two harbors at Rhodes, galleys, horse transports, and other vessels. Bérenger added four galleys (or horse transports) and a hundred Hospitallers to the host. Processions were organized, solemn masses celebrated.

Pierre Thomas was everywhere, preaching,

²¹ *Lettere segrete*, fol. 155^r, letters dated 27 June to the captain of the Gulf (text in Mas Latrie, III, 752) and to the duke, councillors, and provveditori in Crete: "Quia optamus pro omni bono respectu scire continuo progressus domini regis Cipri, qui hodie mane recessit de Veneciis. . . ." Peter had thus been at sea for three weeks when on 19 July (1365) Urban V congratulated him upon his departure from Venice with a "numerous band of warriors in Christ's service." The holy war against the infidel was to be fought courageously with the companions and crusaders he had brought together from various Christian nations (Paul Lecacheux and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V [1362-1370] se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 3 [Paris, n.d.], no. 1887, p. 329).

²² *Lettere segrete*, fol. 159^r, published in Mas Latrie, III, 752-53. The reference is doubtless to the Anatolian emirates.

absolving sinners, visiting the sick, distributing crusaders' crosses, reconciling adversaries in the king's council, and settling disputes between the sailors and the local inhabitants. He won the affection of the entire host at Rhodes, "and he who could kiss his hand or had received his benediction, accounted himself safe from every peril that day." Men-at-arms who had not said confession for ten or twenty years now came to the legate to unburden themselves of accumulated sins. But Mézières acknowledges that most of the motley forces gathered at Rhodes had not come with the lofty ideals of true crusaders, but rather with the desire for glory, gain, or royal favor.²³

Rhodes was the scene of a formidable array. Machaeras states that Peter I had sixteen galleys ready for action, and they were soon joined by three more from Genoa. He also says that John of Lusignan had assembled 108 vessels, including 33 horse transports (which he calls *σατίες*), ten merchantmen (*καραβία*), and twenty other craft "which they call doves" (*καὶ ἕτερα τὰ λέγουν περιστιρία*).²⁴ Counting all these, the four Rhodian galleys, "and the many different merchantmen," Machaeras puts the grand total of Peter's armada at 165 vessels (*ἄρμενα*).²⁵ According to Mézières, our best source for the crusade,

among the galleys, horse transports, packets, ships, and other vessels [Peter I] had with him about one hundred at his own expense, except for the four

²³ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet (1954), pp. 124-25.

²⁴ Although Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, par. 162, p. 146, uses the word *σατία*, *saettia*, "arrow," for a horse transport (as does Strambaldi, p. 65), it usually denotes "an uncovered swift rowing vessel, used because of its speed for scouting" (Dawkins, II, 104), like the popular *fusta*, a long, narrow, fast, light galley with about two dozen oarsmen. Actually the *colomba* of the later middle ages was apparently not a "dove," *columba*, *περιστέρα*, but a "keel," and hence by metonymy is used for a vessel, on which cf. Dawkins, II, 113, and see especially Henry and Renée Kahane, "Italo-Byzantine Etymologies," *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, XXIII (1953), 280-82. The various types of naval transport used in the Mediterranean during this period (galleys, *fuste*, *naves*, *taridae*, *saettiae* [= *sagittae*], *barcae*, *ligna*, *panfili*, cogs, and "squiffes") are described in C.-E. Dufourcq, *L'Espagne catalane et le Maghrib aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, Paris, 1966, pp. 36-47 and ff.

²⁵ *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 167, p. 150. The sixteenth-century chroniclers Francesco Amadi, in René de Mas Latrie's edition (1891), p. 414, and Florio Bustron, ed. Mas Latrie, in the *Mélanges historiques*, V (1886), 262, also give the grand total of the armada as 165 vessels, their texts being almost word for word the same, ". . . era de galee 33, fuste 6, nave 9, barchi 13, vasselli da condur cavalli 11, et altri navigli 20, che feceno la somma de vele 92: et feceno armar a Rhodi

horse transports and a few other craft belonging to the Hospital, in which vessels there were about a thousand armed nobles. . . . The king's whole army amounted to about 10,000 fighting men and about 1,400 horses.²⁶

In any event Peter's preparations were sufficient to lead the emirs of Ephesus (*Altoluogo*) and Miletus (*Palatia*) to send envoys to Rhodes to seek assurance that the Cypriote crusade was not going to be directed against their states. The emirs offered to pay tribute and to recognize Peter's nominal suzerainty over them.²⁷

If we cannot determine the number of Peter's men and the size of his fleet, we can identify a good many of his fellow crusaders. In fact Machaeras and Iorga have done so for us.²⁸ Among some fifty names, and many of them are only names, we should mention once more Guillaume Roger, viscount of Turenne, who had sold the Venetians the papal "grace" for trading with the Mamluks, and who in the hour of peril and crisis would advocate the abandoning of captured Alexandria.²⁹ We should not fail to note the allegedly sage and valiant knight Jean de Reims—*il aime armes et amours*—who later furnished the admiring Machaut with a full account of the crusade.³⁰ John Lascaris Calopherus, a Byzantine notable and a friend of Peter I, was also among those who took part in the sack of Alexandria. Calopherus, who had been converted to Catholicism by Pierre Thomas, looms large in the annals of the later fourteenth century as a link between Latin Europe and the Greek East.³¹

Raymond de la Pradèle, archbishop of Nicosia (*Levcosia*) from 1361 to 1376, may have gone on

the expedition, and in any event he sent a contingent of troops, doubtless at his own expense. Guy d'Ibelin, bishop of Limassol (*Nemosia*), also sent troops, and very likely he too should be numbered among the crusaders.³² Later on, shortly after the return of the fleet to Cyprus, Raymond de la Pradèle was to officiate at the funeral of Pierre Thomas at Famagusta in January, 1366.³³

²⁶ Cf. Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 163, p. 146, lines 24–26, and see in general Jean Richard, "Un Evêque d'Orient latin au XIV^e siècle: Guy d'Ibelin, O.P., évêque de Limassol, et l'inventaire de ses biens," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LXXIV (1950), 98–133; M. H. Laurent and J. Richard, "La Bibliothèque d'un évêque dominicain de Chypre en 1367," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXI (1951), 447–54. Guy had crowned Peter king of Cyprus in the cathedral of Nicosia in November, 1358 (Strambaldi, p. 36). He died on 29 March, 1367 (Richard, *Bull. corr. hellénique*, LXXIV, 101–2). His successor Aymar de Lavont, precentor of the church of Toulon, was named on the following 18 August (according to Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 367, although his actual appointment to the see appears to have been on the sixteenth).

During the period of vacancy and Aymar's presumed absence from Limassol (from 1 April, 1367, to 31 March, 1368) financial accounts, which are still extant (Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Instrumenta Miscellanea, Reg. 2468), were kept by the Greek scribe Theodore Kontostephanos for the capitular vicar Bernard Anselme. These accounts of receipts and expenditures (of the cathedral church of Limassol) have been published with an illuminating introduction by Jean Richard, *Chypre sous les Lusignans: Documents chypriotes des Archives du Vatican*, Paris, 1962, pp. 61–110 (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'archéologie de Beyrouth, vol. LXXIII). In Cyprus the tithe was collected from the spoils of war as well as from the revenues of feudal lordships, and was paid to the cathedral church of the diocese. The crown lands were not exempt, and were at least as large as all feudal holdings put together. Peter I drew 100,000 bezants every year from the diocese of Limassol alone, his brother John of Antioch and his nephew Hugh of Galilee each about 20,000; fiefs paying 100 to 500 bezants in tithes, and so yielding 1,000 to 5,000 bezants a year, were not uncommon, and attest to the relative wealth of the Cypriote nobility, on which contemporaries and the later chroniclers often dilate. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Cypriotes could hardly afford the crusade on which they were embarking.

²⁷ Before Raymond de la Pradèle, the well-known Philippe de Chambarlhac had held the see of Nicosia for almost twenty years, from 1342 to 1360 (cf. John L. La Monte, "A Register of the Cartulary of the Cathedral of Santa Sophia of Nicosia," *Byzantion*, V [1929–30], nos. 110–16, 118–26, pp. 483 ff.). On 21 July, 1360, Philippe was transferred by Innocent VI to the archbishopric of Bordeaux (Eubel, I, 150), but died in June of the following year before he could take up his new duties (Louis de Mas Latrie, "Histoire des archevêques latins de l'île de Chypre," *Archives de l'Orient latin*, II [Paris, 1884, repr. Brussels, 1964], 267–72). Raymond was named archbishop of Nicosia on 29 January, 1361, as Philippe's immediate successor (Eubel, I, 365), and there was thus no intervening occupant of the see, as Mas

anchora altre galee et navigli per accompagnar l'armata del re fino la somma de vele, tra piccole e grande, 165" (Bustron). Cf. Diomede Strambaldi, also ed. Mas Latrie (1893), pp. 65, 67, who has recorded the same total.

²⁸ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 127–28.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 127; Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 166, p. 148, and vol. II, pp. 113–14; Strambaldi, p. 66; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 281.

³⁰ *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 163, 167, pp. 146, 148, 150; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 278–80, 282, 285; and cf. Strambaldi, pp. 67, 68.

³¹ Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (1877), vv. 3322–77, pp. 101–2.

³² *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 5902–43, pp. 179–80.

³³ Oskar Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (1355–1375)*, Warsaw, 1930, repr. London, 1972, pp. 91 ff., 101–3, 272 ff.; David Jacoby, "Jean Lascaris Calophéros, Chypre et la Morée," *Revue des études byzantines*, XXVI (1968), 189–228; and Ambrosius K. Eszer, *Das abenteuerliche Leben des Johannes Laskaris Kalopheros*, Wiesbaden, 1969, pp. 32–37, 125.

According to Machaeras, the legate Pierre Thomas had announced in Rhodes that the crusaders were going to Syria, which was sad news for the merchants of Famagusta, for as usual they had purchased many things in Syria, and saw no easy way to obtain delivery before the expedition set out.³⁴ This was presumably an attempt to mislead the government of the boy ruler of Egypt, al-Ashraf Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Sha'bān (1363–1376), and if the watchful Venetians were also deceived, so much the better. Egypt was ripe for attack, Alexandria for plucking. Over the years successful wars against the Mongols of Persia and profitable campaigns against the kings of Cilician Armenia had helped enrich the acquisitive Mamluk emirs, who had finally fallen under the sway of the remarkable soldan an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad. An-Nāṣir's third reign (he was twice deposed) witnessed the height of medieval Egyptian culture (1310–1341). An-Nāṣir preferred diplomacy to war and (for the most part) justice to rapacity; he enjoyed the company of learned men and the breeding of fleet horses; he built beautiful mosques, fine palaces, and public works. But chaos returned to Egypt when he died, and in the next forty-two years twelve of his descendants followed him on the throne, eight sons, two grandsons, and two great-grandsons. Sha'bān was a grandson, about eleven years old in 1365. Although his reign was to be longer than that of any other of an-Nāṣir's descendants, he was a puppet in the hands of the grasping emir Yelbogha al-Khāṣṣikī, who could see no need of an extensive coastal defense, for the last effort to invade Egypt by sea had been that of Louis IX of France more than a century before.³⁵

At some point during the naval rendezvous at Rhodes, however, Peter I finally revealed his

plans to the royal council. Philippe de Mézières says that he now proposed to attack the "soldan of Babylon [Cairo], who held the holy city of Jerusalem and his heritage," the Latin kingdom of the crusaders of old. He would strike "at the head and not at the tail." Alexandria was to be the target. It was one of the chief commercial stations in the Levant and the source of much revenue to the Mamluk rulers of Egypt. Guillaume de Machaut informs us that Percival of Cologne, Peter's chamberlain, who had been a prisoner in Alexandria,³⁶ and knew the city well, had advised his master:

Que vous usez de mon conseil
Et que faciez vos voiles tendre
Droit vers la cité d'Alixandre.³⁷

At the beginning of October (1365) Peter was ready to embark. He had waited for the autumnal overflow of the Nile, which would impede the emirs' efforts to send reinforcements to Alexandria. As the hour of departure drew near, Pierre Thomas mounted the high stern of the king's galley, where he could be seen by all the host. With the king standing beside him, all eyes upon him, the legate blessed the soldiery and the sea that was to bear them on their mission. A banner with the red lion of Lusignan was raised over the royal galley, trumpets blared, and thousands of voices resounded to heaven, crying *Vivat, vivat Petrus!* and *Contra Saracenos infideles!* "Up to now the army did not know where the king planned to go," says Mézières, "whether to Turkey or Syria or Egypt." The fleet sailed from the twin harbors at Rhodes on Saturday, 4 October, and rounding Castelrosso made straight for the small island of Crambusa, near Cape Kelidonya at the western approach to the Gulf of Adalia. There the sailors took on fresh water, and the soldiers apparently spent the night of the fourth on the island. The next morning the king promptly put to sea again, sailing due south. When the fleet was well away from shore, Peter publicly announced his destination. "Then all rejoiced," says Mézières, "and raised their voices, shouting *Alexandria!*, assum-

Latrie, *AOL*, II, 272–74, and Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas* (1966), p. 301, note 16, considered possible, believing that Raymond first appeared in the sources as archbishop of Nicosia in connection with Pierre Thomas's funeral.

³⁴ Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 169–70, p. 150: "... διὰ πολλὰ πράματα τὰ εἶχαν ἀγορασμένα εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ δὲν ἦτον μέγας νὰ σηκωθοῦν εὐκόλα." Cf. Strambaldi, p. 67.

³⁵ On an-Nāṣir's third reign, see the almost classic account of Gustav Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, IV: *Gesch. d. Abbasidenchalifats in Ägypten*, Stuttgart, 1860, pp. 299 ff., whose treatment of Sha'bān's reign and of Peter I's Alexandria crusade is much less satisfactory, *ibid.*, pp. 510 ff. (and on this work, note D. M. Dunlop, "Some Remarks on Weil's History of the Caliphs," in B. Lewis and P. M. Holt, eds., *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962, pp. 315–29).

³⁶ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 1998–2000, p. 61. The customs duties of Alexandria were said to be 40,000 florins a month (Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, p. 297).

³⁷ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2041–43, p. 62. Percival of Cologne was said to be Peter's most trusted counselor (*ibid.*, vv. 1973–74, p. 60). He was a Poitevin.

ing the city was already taken, as though it were some little castle or town."³⁸

Guillaume de Machaut reports, however, that when trumpeters gathered the fleet together to hear the king's announcement at sea, most of the crusaders were dismayed. Alexandria was too strong a city; no one could take it; the "emir" could mobilize 500,000 men in an hour! The king had been badly advised; they would be outnumbered a hundred to four; but if they had to die in Alexandria, at least they would win God's favor in doing so.³⁹ Northerly winds helped carry them from the Gulf of Adalia to the mouths of the Nile, and although the galleys and transports became separated along the way, "God miraculously brought the whole army together in the [Old] Harbor of Alexandria in the early morning of the fourth day after leaving land."⁴⁰ It was Thursday, 9 October, *jour de la feste St. Denis*,⁴¹ an auspicious day for French crusaders. It was also King Peter's thirty-sixth birthday.⁴²

Alexandria was a familiar sight to many of the adventurers and oarsmen in the galleys. It was said to be a beautiful city and the strongest fortress in the Mamluk domains, but the walls were in a state of some decay. Sandy beaches reached up to the white-stone houses built amid the palm groves outside the walls. Every day the narrow streets were thronged with picturesque crowds, Moslems in white turbans, Jews in yellow, Christians in blue headgear, merchants and travelers from every part of Europe and Asia. King Peter's chamberlain, Percival of Cologne, had told him that Alexandria was so large a city that one saw there "a hundred thousand people in one place," but that the inhabitants were unwarlike, and would flee like goats at the first clash of arms. Friday would be the day to attack, for there was a prophecy widely believed among the Moslems

that on that day Alexandria would be taken and destroyed.⁴³

The Saracens gathered along the shore, astonished and fearful at the sight of the fleet. When first sighted, the galleys and transports had been mistaken for Venetian merchantmen, which usually came to Alexandria about this time. Remaining well offshore, the Christians dropped anchor after entering the western or Old Harbor, which was separated from the New Harbor (on the east) by a promontory leading north to Pharos Island. They had come most opportunely. The recently appointed governor (*wālī*) of the city was absent on a pilgrimage to Mecca, and only a small garrison, with no Mamluks among them, was manning the massive fortifications. The rising waters of the Nile would hinder the dispatch of troops from the capital city of Cairo.

The king and his council decided not to land immediately. A quiet night on shipboard would better prepare the crusaders for action on the morrow. "Then all that day and night the Saracens fortified the city," says Mézières, "and added beyond reckoning to their army along the shore. They seemed hardly worried about our forces, and with trumpets, standards raised aloft, and numberless torches on the shore of the harbor they kept a careful watch upon us through the whole night."⁴⁴

When morning came on Friday, 10 October, continues Mézières, the sun shone brightly on the shields, arms, and galleys of the Christian host "to the terror of the enemies of the cross." But actually many of the inhabitants came out from the city, marveling at the naval apparition under their walls. There were the usual vendors with wares at a bargain. Few of them seemed aware of the extent of the danger which lay ahead. Presently members of the garrison and a rough corps of beduins spread out along the

³⁸ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 127–29. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2084 ff., p. 64, inaccurately places the departure of the fleet on Monday, 28 September, which date fell on Sunday in 1365. On Crambusa, note also Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, par. 171, p. 150, and vol. II, pp. 115–16.

³⁹ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2110–41, pp. 64–65.

⁴⁰ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 129.

⁴¹ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2192–95, p. 67; Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 171, p. 150; Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, p. 130: "Erat autem dies Iovis et hora quasi sexta."

⁴² Cf. *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 130–36, p. 5.

⁴³ Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2012–39, pp. 61–62, and cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 286 ff.

⁴⁴ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 130–31, and see the valuable article by Paul Kahle, "Die Katastrophe des mittelalterlichen Alexandria," in the *Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*, LXVIII (Cairo, 1935–40), *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 137–54, esp. pp. 144–45. In the description of the capture and loss of Alexandria, which Pierre Thomas prepared for Pope Urban V and the Emperor Charles IV after the Christian withdrawal from the city, he refers to the "quiete indicta a meridie circa usque ad tertiam alterius diei sequentis," i.e. the rest prescribed for the army from noontime of 9 October until about 9:00 A.M. on the tenth, when the attack began (Mézières included this letter in his *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 135).

shoreline to defend the city against the attack which seemed in the offing. They had arms but no armor, and were hoping to prevent the enemy from landing with arrows, javelins, and swords. The acting governor, a certain Janghara, who had come to Alexandria only four months before, yielded to the insistence of those who owned property outside the walls which they were anxious to protect. It would have been better to gather all available manpower within the city to defend the walls and gates.⁴⁵

King Peter and his council had decided to begin landing operations at the hour of tierce. Pierre Thomas gave the armed multitude his blessing, and urged them "courageously to fight God's battle, because today the gates of paradise are open!" A royal trumpeter gave the signal. Slowly the galleys and other ships began to move toward the crowded shore in a set order. Saracen archers were waiting for them, and shot arrows into the masses of men on deck "like rain upon the earth." But the galleys continued their approach, and the sailors began to throw out gangplanks for landing. The Saracens

showed no fear of Christian missiles, and covering themselves with their shields, they waded breast-high into the water to oppose the invaders.

According to an-Nuwairī, a group of Moroccan volunteers tried to prevent the crusaders from landing by hurling naphtha firebrands at the approaching galleys, but they received so little and such late support from the shore that the few brands they could throw apparently fell wide of the mark, and Mézières does not mention them. The Saracens' resistance was such that it took almost an hour to effect a landing. As they began to draw back, however, the Christian infantrymen poured from the galleys, and mounted men-at-arms rode out from the lowered sterns of the horse transports. Mézières says that "the Saracens turned their backs and fled toward the city, but our men went after them, and cutting them down, pursued them to the very gate[s]."⁴⁶ Machaut informs us that, in these first encounters, the 8,000 men in the Cypriote army killed so many Saracens that the sea was awash with blood,⁴⁷ and an-Nuwairī also attests to the large loss of Moslem life before the gates were closed.⁴⁸

The Saracens within the city promptly manned the seaside walls, but the crusaders lit fires against the iron-bound, heavy-timbered gates, and (says Mézières) "within the hour the Saracens, assailed by God, left the walls and towers, and their courage failing, they abandoned the city and fled toward Babylon [Cairo]." Christian standards were soon flying from the ramparts, and the king, the legate, and the whole army could enter, *cruce praecedente*, through the burned-out gates. "The great city of Alexandria was [thus] captured by the Christians, with divine assistance, at about the ninth hour, on Friday, the tenth day of October in the year 'sixty-five."⁴⁹

Guillaume de Machaut, however, has a rather

⁴⁵ Kahle, "Die Katastrophe," *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 144-46; A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1938, pp. 353-54. Both Kahle and Atiya have based their accounts on that of the Arabic writer an-Nuwairī, who lived in Alexandria and fled from the city at the time of the Christian attack. An-Nuwairī had first settled in Alexandria in 1337. He began his long, digressive work on the capture of the city at the beginning of the year 1366, about four months after the event, and finished it during the spring of 1374. See also Ét. Combe, "Le Texte de Nuwairī sur l'attaque d'Alexandrie par Pierre I de Lusignan," in the *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Farouk I University*, III (Alexandria, 1946), 99-110. The old but still useful dissertation of Is. Jos. H. Paul Herzsohn, *Der Überfall Alexandrien's durch Peter I, König von Jerusalem und Cypern*, Bonn, 1886, is also based on an-Nuwairī. The Arabic text of an-Nuwairī is now available to those who can use it, in Étienne Combe (d. 1962) and A. S. Atiya, eds., *Kitāb al-Ilmām by Muḥammad B. Qāsim al-Nuwairī*, 6 vols., Hyderabad, India, 1968-73 (in the *Dā'iratu'l Ma'ārif il-Osmania Publications*, new series, no. IX-XIII).

Shortly after 1350 the Westphalian priest Ludolf of Sudheim (of the diocese of Paderborn), who had visited Alexandria during the course of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land (1336-1341), described Alexandria as "prima civitas Aegypti maritima et una de melioribus civitatibus soldani. . . . Haec civitas est pulcherrima et fortissima turribus excelsis et muris inexpugnabilibus munita. . . . In hac civitate soldanus milites habet stipendiarios et satellites, civitatem et portum custodientes. . . . Haec civitas humano visui inexpugnabilis videtur et tamen faciliter esset capienda. De quo mihi plus dicere non est cura. . . ." (*De itinere terrae sanctae liber*, ed. Ferdinand Deycks in the *Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*, XXV [1851], 35-36).

⁴⁶ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 131-32.

⁴⁷ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2426-83, 2518 ff., pp. 74-77; Kahle, *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 146, describes the use of the naphtha firebrands. As the crusaders were landing in the Old Harbor, the admiral of the Hospital, Ferlino d' Airasca, landed in the New Harbor with the members of his Order, and attacked the Saracens from the east (*à senestre*), thus taking them in the rear (Machaut, *op. cit.*, vv. 2499-2527, pp. 76-77). On the office of admiral among the Hospitallers, note Berthold Waldstein-Wartenberg, *Rechtsgeschichte des Malteserordens*, Vienna, 1969, pp. 118-119.

⁴⁸ Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 355-56.

⁴⁹ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 132, and note Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3143-47, pp. 95-96.

different story to tell in his prolix fashion. When King Peter contemplated the locked gates and the arbalesters on the high walls, he had his trumpeter sound a retreat. He ordered his tired men to rest, and to lead the remaining horses from the transports. When this had been done, some of the knights gathered around him. Greeting them in friendly fashion, Peter observed that they must all consider how to take the city:

Car certainement il nous faut
Avoir conseil par quele guise
Ceste grant cité sera prise.⁵⁰

The knights were discouraged. The city could not be taken either by assault or by siege, and they could never undermine the walls or starve out the defenders. The Christians faced destruction, for the enemy outnumbered them "bien mille contre un." Such was the common view. Peter summoned his council to pursue the subject at a higher level of wisdom; it would be shameful, he told them, to withdraw without taking the city or at least assailing the Moslems. He asked for advice that would do honor to God and no dishonor to the Christian host. When the sages had heard him through and weighed his words, an admiral (*un amiraut*) was the first to speak: "Sire, you can clearly see that this city is too strong. . . ." The walls were high and thick, the solid towers well supplied with artillery (*bonnes tours . . . bien garnies d'artillerie*). The Saracens on the walls were clever and watchful; they had plenty of stones and the mangonels to hurl them. Under these conditions, "each of them will be worth ten of your people." Furthermore, all the way from Alexandria to Cairo and even to Jerusalem, according to the eloquent admiral, there was not a cottage, house, or fortress in which the Christians might take refuge if need be. "Sire, by our loyalty," said the council in unison, "he is telling you the simple truth."⁵¹

But Peter was confident that God would reward their efforts in the Christian cause. He asked them merely to show the gallantry of

knighthood. "Then they replied all together, 'We say what seems best to us. Sire, go wherever you please. No one of us will desert you, for our honor and our lives are yours, whether we live or die!'" Peter's heart rejoiced at the response, and he had a crier proclaim throughout the host that he was going to attack the city. He offered 1,000 florins to the first person to mount the walls, 500 to the second, and 300 to the third; then he summoned his chamberlain, Percival of Cologne, who knew the city, and who had said that one gate was "less than the others," and that this was the place for an assault in force. Percival identified the weak spot in the circuit of the walls as the "Customhouse Gate" (*c'est la Porte de l'Audouanne*), through which all merchandise passed into the city. Peter then summoned his constable, "who was a notable person," and his two marshals. He told them that the attack would begin at once, and that Percival would take them to the gate. A brief hour sufficed for a trumpeter to assemble the army at the Customhouse Gate on the eastern end of the north wall, and the assault was about to begin.⁵²

In the meantime the emir Janghara, after the vain attempt to stop the Christians from landing, had witnessed the Moslem flight toward the city gates from his position on the peninsula called Pharos Island. He was wounded by an arrow, and was almost cut off from the city by the Christian surge toward the gates, but riding and wading with his followers through the water, he succeeded somehow in re-entering the city through the Necropolis Gate (*Bāb al-Khaukhah*), the only gate in the west wall. He hastened to the nearby treasury, and had all the gold and silver packed for speedy shipment through one of the southern land gates to Cairo. The Alexandrian police rounded up some fifty Latins, consular officials and merchants (including the Venetian consul Andrea Venier), and sent them off as hostages through a landward gate toward the town of Damanhūr. They executed one obstreperous Latin *pour encourager les autres*. By this time the Christians had reached the north wall, and had

⁵⁰ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2538 ff., 2995–97, pp. 77–79. Machaut says that there were more than 20,000 Saracens manning the walls in defense of the city.

⁵¹ The admiral in question was presumably the Hospitaller Ferlino d'Airasca, since Pierre Thomas later held him up to opprobrium for refusing to attempt the defense of Alexandria after its capture (Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 138–39, and cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 294, 301).

⁵² *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2598–2805, pp. 79–85. On the location of the seven gates of Alexandria, see Kahle, *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 142–43, and Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 352, note 3. The Customs Building was within the north wall of the city, between the Sea Gate (*Bāb al-Bahr*, *Porta Maris*) and the Divan Gate (*Bāb ad-Diwan*). The French called the latter gate the *Porte de la Douane*, both because it was near the customs offices and because *dīwān* sounded to them like *douane*.

tried to burn down the Sea Gate (Bāb al-Bahr) by rolling barrels of fuel up to the gate and lighting them. Their opponents on the wall drove them off, and the Christians moved farther east, where they found a place which lacked defenders, and where there was no moat to prevent their climbing the wall. Thus, according to an-Nuwairī, they found the vulnerable area at the Bāb ad-Dīwān, which the French knew as the Porte de la Douane or Customhouse Gate, and to which Machaut says that Percival of Cologne had directed them.

The crusaders burned down the Customhouse Gate with apparently no interference from the Moslems. They forced an entry through the burning gate, and climbed the walls with scaling ladders. There were no members of the garrison at this point, because the chief clerk and the inspector of the government office or Divan had barred the gate (and apparently locked the inner portals leading to the customs area) to prevent merchants from using it to evade payment of customs duties. By so doing they seem to have blocked the inner approaches to the towers flanking the Customhouse Gate. Quick access to these towers was clearly impossible from the rest of the wall, an obvious defect in the defense system which Percival of Cologne may well have observed during the period of his imprisonment in Alexandria. In any event treachery was suspected and, later on, the governor of the city executed the chief clerk, who was rumored to have been in contact with the king of Cyprus.

When the Moslems saw the enemy on the wall and streaming through the broken, burning Customhouse Gate, they took to flight through the three landward gates in the south and east walls of the city. Crosses and Christian standards were set up on the battlements, and the crusaders began to plunder the city. An-Nuwairī has left us a heartrending tale of pillage. The invaders broke into warehouses, private homes, and hospices, and piled their loot on camels, mules, and horses. They slew all who tried to hide, crippled beasts of burden they did not need, shattered lamps in the mosques, and seized a large number of terrified prisoners.

The crusaders ran a riot of destruction from Friday afternoon until the next day, 11 October, plundering and setting fire to the booths of the money-changers and to the shops of the dealers in rich fabrics, old clothes, wax candles, glass decanters, and pots and pans. They

ransacked the goldsmiths' shops, and seized the goods of merchants from Cairo and Damascus, which they found all packed and ready for export; they carried off the bolts of fine silk which Persian and other merchants had brought to Alexandria, and robbed private houses of jewels, ornaments, copper ware, and even beds. The fires they set spread through wide areas, consuming public markets, Moslem schools, and the embroidery works, and reaching into every street, alley, and square in the city. Oil, honey, and tallow ran in the streets littered with broken glass and earthenware. In ignorance or senseless fury they set the torch to the *fondachi* of the Catalans, Genoese, and Marseillais, but to an-Nuwairī's satisfaction they failed to find the Moslem armory, which was stocked with weapons. The pious crusaders killed Moslems everywhere they found them, even in the mosques, where many had apparently sought refuge. They destroyed what they could not carry off, and stores of hazelnuts and lesser wares went up in smoke, as did whatever else the marauders could not put aboard their overladen vessels, of which (says an-Nuwairī) there were more than seventy. Mosques and other buildings were set on fire within the walls, and the palaces and tombs on Pharos Island were demolished. Dead bodies were left behind to rot in the baths and markets, and the streets were strewn with the carcasses of animals. Spices were left piled up on the shore, because the galleys and transports could hold no more. Precious goods were thrown overboard as the vessels sank too low in the water for safe navigation. An-Nuwairī says that, if the Franks had not burned down two of the three landward gates, they might have remained masters of the city, and the Moslems would have been hard put to expel them.⁵³ If Allah had not abandoned his people, he had certainly chastised

⁵³ For summaries of an-Nuwairī's account of the destruction of Alexandria, see Kahle, *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 147–53, and Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 358–67. Machaut, in his description of *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2806 ff., pp. 85 ff., says that the crusaders killed 20,000 Saracens (v. 2952, p. 90). Although he provides us with correct dates for the siege and capture of the city, Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins (1932), I, bk. II, pars. 171–72, pp. 150, 152, has little to add to our other sources, and erroneously states that the crusaders remained in the city for only three days. Cf. Amadi, pp. 414–15; Strambaldi, pp. 68–69; Florio Bustron, pp. 262–63. Mézières, who was a closer witness of these grim events than an-Nuwairī, has almost nothing to say about the complete ruination of Alexandria.

them. There had never been so great a slaughter, says Machaut, since the time of Pharaoh.⁵⁴

Since King Peter had hoped to hold Alexandria as a bridgehead for a possible attack on Cairo and as a landing stage for the reconquest of Jerusalem, the reckless burning of the two landward gates was a grave setback to his plans. A relief force from Cairo would presumably arrive sooner than the gates could be replaced. Peter had, therefore, to destroy a bridge over the great canal which connected Alexandria with the Nile at Fūwah. The bridge was the chief link between the embankment road from Cairo and the burned-out gates. On the late afternoon of Friday, 10 October, Peter sallied forth with a company of forty men to remove the bridge, but according to Machaut he almost fell into the midst of some "hundreds, even thousands" of Saracens, who were apparently guarding the bridge in expectation of reinforcements from Cairo. Fearing to be cut off from his own forces, Peter turned in hasty retreat toward the refuge of the city walls. Machaut says that he had to fight his way out of the perilous encounter, and killed more than a hundred Saracens in doing so.⁵⁵

That night the king was exhausted, "for he had battled much that day and much travailed." He chose a chamber in a well-fortified tower, but there was little time for sleep, because somehow under the cover of darkness a large body of Saracens got into the city by one of the burned-out landward gates. Machaut identifies their place of entry as "S. Mark's Gate," otherwise known as "Pepper Gate" (*la Porte dou Poivre*). Again Peter was in the saddle, as day was dawning on Saturday, 11 October, at the head of fifty or sixty *hommes d'armes* to meet (says the exuberant Machaut) a full 10,000 Saracens. Divine aid made up for the disparity of numbers, and after the clash of arms Peter pursued the Saracens along Pepper Street and out the gate through which they had entered. Like a huntsman he chased them into the countryside to the south of the city, almost as far perhaps as their well-guarded bridge.⁵⁶ It went without saying, however, that the Saracens would do their utmost to recover the port which for almost half a century had provided them with one of their chief sources of revenue.

After the expulsion of the enemy from

Alexandria, but still on Saturday the eleventh, Peter convoked a council, to which he summoned

all manner of folk, men-at-arms, valets, and sergeants, who were all to assemble in a place long and wide, which lies between the city and the sea, for I know not how otherwise to call it. [The place was the peninsula called Pharos Island.] The king appeared amongst his people, and wished to have their counsel, how he should maintain his position, and how one could hold the town.

Their answer was quickly forthcoming, for by S. Peter the Martyr they all wanted to depart. Guillaume Roger, the viscount of Turenne, appointed himself their spokesman, and rose to speak; a nephew of Clement VI and one of the richest lords in southern France, he could always command a hearing. He said they did not have a twentieth, not even a hundredth, of the men necessary to defend the towers, walls, and battlements. There were five hundred points at which the Saracens could enter the city. The Christians lacked supplies, and had no way to get them. The Saracens could put five hundred times 500,000 men into the field "against the few we are . . .," and he concluded: "Now just consider what will happen when the soldan comes riding in—we'll all be taken in a rat-trap, so that in no wise, Sire, do I advise remaining. Let us all depart, for truly the hour is at hand!" Most of the host agreed with him, especially the non-French crusaders; there was no need of further talk, they said, for they could not hold the city, and they did not want to do so.

In vain did Peter give a long reply. It was a thousand times harder to take a city than to defend it; they had abundant arms and ample food, and could get more from Cyprus. Help would also come from Constantinople and Rhodes; men of honor would respond to their call from everywhere in Christendom. Pierre Thomas, *le bon patriarche*, preached to the same effect, or rather to no effect, although he grieved and wept and cried out to heaven that they must remain in Alexandria for God's own honor, the needs of Christendom, and the recovery of Jerusalem. Mézières added his own fervent plea to those of the king and the legate. He offered himself to defend the most vulnerable tower with fifty hands from the ships and forty of his companions in arms. Already on the Friday evening of the apparent conquest, the king had summoned Mézières to his *hostel* in the

⁵⁴ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2978–79, p. 91.

⁵⁵ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 2980–3111, pp. 91–94.

⁵⁶ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3148–3273, pp. 96–99.

Customs House, and offered him one-third of the city as the center and support for the knightly order he had dreamed of creating, the Chevalerie de la Passion, which should have as its chief mission the recovery and defense of the Holy Land. It was all to no avail. So many crusaders had returned to their loot-laden ships that the Saracens were soon re-entering the city, and the reluctant king, his chancellor, and the legate had no alternative but to follow them.⁵⁷

After almost a week of savage plundering, the Christians set sail from Alexandria on Thursday, 16 October, 1365, as an-Nuwairi indicates, "eight days" after their arrival. They carried off 5,000 prisoners to sell or give away as slaves. The soldan himself is said to have come to Alexandria, and his government to have ordered the rebuilding of the ruined city. The Copts and Christian merchants in Egypt were required to raise large sums to help ransom the captives in Christian hands. The soldan's government imprisoned outstanding Christian subjects, many of whom lost their property by confiscation.⁵⁸ But the sack of Alexandria had been so utterly, ruthlessly destructive that the area within the walls was never restored, and the city did not begin to recover its erstwhile commercial importance until well into the nineteenth century.⁵⁹

In some ways, perhaps, there were fewer regrets in Cairo after the withdrawal of the Christian fleet than one might think. If the ruination of Alexandria as a center for Levantine commerce meant fewer foreigners in Egypt, the foreigners were an annoyance to the emirs, the Mamluks, and the army, which drew substantial revenue from the land-taxes, the alum and natron mines, a debased coinage, imposts on Jews and Christians, and (when the chance came) from plunder.⁶⁰ But the desire for vengeance

remained strong among the soldans and the emirs for more than sixty years, until it was finally satisfied by the Egyptian attack upon Cyprus in 1425 and the near conquest of the island in 1426, when King Janus of Lusignan was captured and carried off to eight months' imprisonment in Cairo.⁶¹ One of the chief results of the crusaders' destruction of Alexandria was the eventual destruction of the crusaders' own kingdom of Cyprus.

According to Philippe de Mézières, the storm-tossed voyage of the Christian fleet to Cyprus was so terrifying that the crusaders wished they had remained to do God's work in Alexandria. But they finally landed safely at Limassol on the southern coast of the island, and the galleys continued on around Cape Greco to Famagusta to unload the booty.⁶² King Peter and Pierre Thomas went to Nicosia, where the legate had the king and the army give thanks to God by organizing a procession and celebrating their victory over the Saracens. Pierre preached reassurance to the Cypriotes for the war which had thus begun with the soldan and for the crusade upon which they seemed now to have embarked. After a meeting of the royal council, Peter asked the legate to return to the Curia Romana, inform the pope of what had been accomplished, and seek further aid, which Pierre Thomas agreed to do, and bidding the king farewell, he left for Famagusta, whence he planned to sail for Avignon. Soon after his arrival he found that "avaricious merchants wanted to go to Alexandria, and proposed to make their own peace with the soldan." Pierre forbade traffic with the infidel under sentence of excommunication. A certain Venetian, however, who cared little for the ban, set sail for Alexandria in a galley, but ran into such perils at sea that he turned back to Cyprus, suffered shipwreck, lost the galley and all he had, and barely escaped with his life, "and even to this day," says Mézières, "while the aforesaid ban is still in effect, more and more ships from everywhere have set out for Alexandria on commercial ventures, and almost all have encountered dangers, and one merchant, who got through safely, was seized by the Saracens."⁶³

It was probably during Pierre Thomas's residence in Famagusta that he prepared an

⁵⁷ Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3286–3610, pp. 100–109; Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet (1954), pp. 133–34, 138; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 299–301, and on the Order of the Passion, *ibid.*, pp. 347–51, 453–59, 490 ff.

⁵⁸ Cf. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3798–3809, p. 115.

⁵⁹ Kahle, *Mélanges Maspero*, III, 139–40, 154; Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 367–69, 377. In the address which Pierre Thomas intended for Urban V (see below), he says that the crusaders withdrew from Alexandria "on the sixth day," which would agree with an-Nuwairi's statement if Pierre is counting not from the day of the assault (10 October) but from the first day of occupation (Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, p. 139).

⁶⁰ On the chief sources of income to the Egyptian state, see S. Lane-Poole, *Egypt in the Middle Ages*, London, 1925, pp. 303–4, note.

⁶¹ George Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (Cambridge, 1948), 467–93.

⁶² Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 173, p. 154.

⁶³ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 134–35, 140–41.

open letter or address to Pope Urban V and the Emperor Charles IV concerning the Alexandria crusade, which had not been "our battle but God's, and this is more wondrous than all wonders, and the story will be told forever . . . , because the fighting lasted hardly an hour, and no one of our men died in the battle although the walls were inexpugnable, and unarmed men were the first to climb them." Alexandria had fallen to the Christian host by a miracle, a city as populous as Paris, as attractive as Venice, as well planned as Genoa, rich, delightful, fertile, a center for merchants as for all mankind, the very queen of Egypt, and Alexandria might have become the eastern gateway of Christendom if only the crusaders had held it. Pierre Thomas's lament was designed for presentation in public (*nunc materiam deduco gemitus in publicum*); his turgid style and biblical quotations would have been well received at the Curia Romana, where he probably hoped to read his text.

Wickedness had divided those whom God had joined together to take the city, according to Pierre Thomas, and contention had arisen among the princes. The English had withdrawn first, having conspired with a prince, whose name Pierre forebore to mention [Guillaume Roger] because of his parentage and his evil intent. Some French, more Germans, and all the Italians had cried out against him, and it was at this point that Philippe de Mézières had offered to defend the tower most exposed to attack. But there was wholesale desertion in the ranks of the crusaders, who had angered God by their lack of faith in the divine power, and the admiral of the Hospital, to his lasting disgrace, was to be found among these miscreants.

They had witnessed miracles in the voyage to Alexandria, the flight of the Moslems, and the capture of the city without opposition, but they had lacked faith, sufficient numbers, and support from the West. Pierre appealed for a renewal of the crusade, and implored the pope to "exhort the people, grant indulgences, expend the treasure of the Church," and he looked for help from the emperor, whom rumor declared to be rich, "to whom God has given more wisdom than to Solomon, more power than to Pharaoh." The Venetians and Genoese would provide ships, the papacy indulgences, the people devotion, the clergy prayers and fasting, and thus all Christendom would make its contribution. "Show thy power, O lord, and come

and deliver us. Deliver that holy city of Jerusalem!"⁶⁴

Pierre Thomas did not long survive the composition of this address, and from the abandonment of Alexandria until the day he died, according to the chancellor Mézières, his usual joyfulness gave way to melancholy. As he got ready to leave Famagusta for Avignon, Pierre threw himself into the onerous solemnities of Christmastide, celebrating mass almost interminably. On Christmas eve he tramped through the mud from the Carmelite convent, where he was staying, to the cathedral church of S. Nicholas to celebrate matins. His condition had been weakened by prolonged fasts and vigils, and he caught cold, for he wore the same light clothing in winter as in summer. On Saturday, 27 December, he went barefooted through the mud from the Carmelite church to S. Mary of Cana outside the city, and standing *nudis pedibus* upon the cold stone floor, he officiated at yet another solemn mass. There were more masses on Sunday and Monday; on Tuesday, the thirtieth, he was in the throes of a high fever; on Wednesday Mézières came from Nicosia with the king's physician.

Pierre Thomas seemed to be better, and Mézières remained with him until Saturday, 3 January (1366), when he insisted that Mézières return to the royal court at Nicosia to complete arrangements for their long journey to Avignon, for the legate and the chancellor were going to the Curia together. On Sunday Pierre said confession for the last time, received the viaticum, and dictated his will to a notary. His condition was getting worse, and on Monday, the fifth, he received extreme unction at the hands of Simon, the bishop of Laodicea, who had been one of the Cypriote envoys to the Curia in August, 1350.⁶⁵ Mézières hastened back to Famagusta, and arrived in time to witness Pierre Thomas's death on the evening of Epiphany, 6 January.⁶⁶ The Franciscan Juan Carmesson, provincial of his order in the Holy Land, preached the funeral sermon, and being suddenly overcome by the Holy Spirit (as he later said), he astonished his auditors by calling

⁶⁴ Mézières has incorporated the address in his *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, ed. Smet, pp. 135–41. He refers to it as an *epistola* (*ibid.*, p. 142).

⁶⁵ On the anti-Turkish pact of 11 August, 1350, note Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, II (Venice, 1878), bk. iv, no. 352, p. 184, and see above, p. 220.

⁶⁶ *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 142–54; Boehlke, *Pierre de Thomas* (1966), pp. 295–307.

Pierre Thomas a saint throughout his sermon,⁶⁷ and although Pierre has never been canonized, his fellow Carmelites have for centuries venerated him as indeed a saint.

The Alexandria crusade had thrilled Europe with the news, known in Avignon by the beginning of December (1365),⁶⁸ of a success against the infidel almost equaling the first capture of Jerusalem in its audacity and carnage. The satisfaction was short-lived, however, as eastern Christians began to feel the weight of Moslem anger. The disruption of trade with Egypt created a shortage of spices, which cost more and more in the western markets.⁶⁹ But the soldan's government sent an emissary to Venice, as Pope Urban V protested to the Doge Marco Corner (on 25 January, 1366), to mislead the servants of Christ by dangling before them "titbits of filthy lucre" (*esca mundani lucri*). The Egyptians sent a similar mission to Genoa, and of course in Urban's opinion their proposals, obviously for peace and the resumption of trade, could only be detrimental to the king of Cyprus and to those who were expected to go on another expedition. Urban therefore forbade the Venetians (and the Genoese) to negotiate with the Egyptian envoys without prior consultation with and the express permission of the Holy See, "especially while the unfinished business of the crusade is still pending."⁷⁰

On 29 January, a week before the pope's letter reached the lagoon, a letter patent of credit and credence had been issued by the doge and the Collegio to Francesco Bembo and Pietro Soranzo, who were setting out for the soldan's court in Cairo.⁷¹ Two other ambassadors, Marino

Venier and Giovanni Foscarini, were sent to the Curia Romana to win for the Republic concessions which the pope seemed unwilling to give. Some months later, on 6 June, the doge and Collegio wrote Venier and Foscarini that the two envoys to Egypt had informed the home government that they had negotiated a treaty (*concordium*) with the soldan. Venier and Foscarini were to give this news to the pope and the cardinals, and "now [wrote the Collegio] you must make every effort to secure your dismissal and our objective, which is that we may be licensed to sail to Alexandria and the other lands subject to the soldan, as the situation of our state requires." After arranging the new treaty with the soldan's government, Bembo and Soranzo had gone straightway to Cyprus to try to make peace between the soldan and Peter I. Venier and Foscarini were authorized to tell the pope and the cardinals that Venice had no doubt such a peace would be made, because the soldan wanted it. Peace therefore depended upon Peter. The Hospitallers were said to be quite agreeable to settling their differences with the Egyptians. The Curia was also to be informed that the new pact which Bembo and Soranzo had made in Cairo contained only the usual commercial statement of duties, tolls, and the like.⁷²

Venier and Foscarini were having their difficulties in Avignon. Their request for a papal license to trade with Egypt had been blocked by a letter, apparently just received at the Curia, from Guido da Bagnolo di Reggio, onetime physician to Peter I of Cyprus. Others had also written such letters (obviously unfavorable to Venice), and again Urban V forbade the Republic either to make or to observe any peace with the soldan without express permission from the Holy See. The Collegio wanted fuller information concerning the charges obviously being made against Venice so that proper steps could be taken to answer them.⁷³ Nevertheless, the doge and Collegio persisted in their efforts to secure the papal license and to arrange a treaty of peace between Egypt and Cyprus although, as they wrote Venier and

⁶⁷ Mézières, *Life of St. Peter Thomas*, pp. 156–57.

⁶⁸ Cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 304–5.

⁶⁹ Thos. Walsingham, *Hist. anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, ad ann. 1365, in the *Rerum britannicarum . . . scriptores*, XXVIII-1 (1863, repr. 1965), 301–2: "Omnia vero genera specierum transmarinarum diu post haec [i.e. the events attending the sack of Alexandria] et rariora et cariora fuere. . . ." Even England was enriched by the spoils of the sack, says Walsingham, for the English crusaders brought back cloths of gold and silk brocades as well as exotic gems. In this portion of his chronicle Walsingham's text is identical with that of the "Monachus S. Albani," *ibid.*, LXIV (1874, repr. 1965), 56–57. Cf. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, II (1886, repr. 1967), 52–53.

⁷⁰ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, no. 12, vol. VII (1752), pp. 134–35; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III (1883), bk. VII, nos. 251–52, p. 45.

⁷¹ Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fol. 182^r, published in Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, III (1855), 753, and cf. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3818–97, pp. 116–18.

⁷² Lettere segrete, fol. 185^v; Mas Latrie, III, 754–55. The government of the young soldan, al-Ashraf Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Sha'bān, had assured the doge that Bembo and Soranzo would be well received in Cairo, and that Venetian merchants would be free to come and go in all Egypt (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 268, p. 48, and Heyd, II, 53).

⁷³ Mas Latrie, III, 755–56, a letter dated 14 June, 1366, "ambaxatoribus nostris in Curia Romana."

Foscarini again on 25 June, the whole matter now rested with the king of Cyprus.⁷⁴ Machaeras states that the Venetians had spread a rumor in the West that peace had been made between the soldan and the king, which ended the plans of the European princes to come to the king's assistance,⁷⁵ but of course Peter had already seen how little help he was likely to get from Europe. Upon his return from Alexandria he had dismissed (in November, 1365) the foreign knights who had helped him take the city, and had rewarded them with gifts of "gold, silver, vessels, jewels, silk cloth, and fresh horses."⁷⁶ Peter was now ready for peace, at least if he could have it on favorable terms.

With the Venetians as mediators, there were exchanges of embassies and presents between Cairo and Cyprus. At the request of the soldan's government, Peter released most of the Saracen captives still held on his island. When the soldan had gained everything he could by negotiation, however, he suddenly became affronted, according to Machaeras, because the Cypriote envoys sent to Cairo were not of sufficient rank for him to receive them without loss of dignity. He declined to make peace. Peter saw that he had been hoodwinked, and sent a French knight to Constantinople to inform Count Amadeo VI of Savoy, who was then in the midst of his so-called crusade, of the Saracens' double-dealing. He urged Amadeo to join the Cypriotes in another attack upon the Mamluk domains. The count replied, however, that "I was indeed ready to come, but the Venetians told me that peace was being made, and there was nothing for me to do: I came here to help my cousin [the Byzantine Emperor John V] and I cannot leave him."⁷⁷

After this, for almost five years, exchanges of embassies between Cyprus and Egypt alternated

with Cypriote raids upon the coasts of Syria and even of Egypt. In the meantime, as early as 1 March, 1366, Raymond Béranger, the master of Rhodes, had alerted the Hospitallers in Rodez in southern France that as a result of the Alexandrian expedition the soldan of Cairo was *multa furia indignatus* against Levantine Christendom and especially against Cyprus and Rhodes. The soldan was seeking no less than the "complete destruction and desolation" of all eastern Christians. He had sent envoys twice to all the Turkish emirs, requesting them to prohibit the export of foodstuffs to Cyprus and Rhodes and to form a Moslem union with him against the Latin Christians "and especially those of Cyprus and Rhodes."

The soldan wanted more galleys and ships for which he would pay all the costs, and he would give the emirs the receipts from the commercial tolls in his ports. His wealth was legendary, and the eastern outposts of Latin Christendom faced the gravest danger unless God intervened to help them and the pope and the princes in Europe put forth a strong arm to protect them. The soldan was known for certain to be building a hundred galleys of his own with which, in alliance with the Turks, he planned to attack Cyprus and Rhodes when the spring came. A large number of Turkish mariners were said already to have responded to his call. They were to help man the Egyptian galleys. Béranger therefore directed the prior of La Selve (in the region of Rodez) to arm two galleys at Marseille in which the marshal of the Order, then Dragonet de Montdragon, should set sail for Rhodes as soon as possible with sixty knights. Another forty were being summoned to sail from Venice. Béranger was thus calling a large proportion of the Hospitallers in France and northern Italy to come to the defense of their island stronghold.⁷⁸ According to Machaut, the Turkish emirs put together a *grant navire* to help the soldan of Cairo, but by a fortunate chance the Cypriote

⁷⁴ Mas Latrie, III, 756–57. Machaut is well informed concerning the mission of the Venetian envoys to Cairo as well as their success in persuading Peter I to make peace with Egypt, although he had prepared a fleet for an attack upon Syria. He sent the fleet to harry the southern coast of Asia Minor, attacking the Turkish emirates, and looked forward to a favorable peace with the soldan (*Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3818–4023, pp. 116–22). Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 176–80, pp. 156–60, gives much the same account.

⁷⁵ *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 175, 183, pp. 156, 162.

⁷⁶ Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3644–66, pp. 110–11.

⁷⁷ *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 181–86, pp. 160–66; the translation is by Dawkins (*ibid.*, p. 167); and cf. Amadi, p. 415; Strambaldi, p. 72; and Florio Bustron, p. 263. On the futility of the negotiations for peace between Cyprus and Egypt, note Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 4036 ff., pp. 122 ff.

⁷⁸ Paul Riant, "Six Lettres relatives aux croisades," *Archives de l'Orient latin*, I (1881, repr. 1964), 391–92. On the marshal of the Hospital, see Waldstein-Wartenberg, *Rechtsgeschichte d. Malteserordens* (1969), esp. pp. 117–18. Three weeks later, on 20 March, 1366 (*more florentino* 1365), Béranger directed the procurator-general of the Order to collect the "dues" (*responsiones*) and all arrears thereof from every Hospitaller of whatsoever rank or condition, because of the "perilous necessity" of self-defense against the soldanus *Babiloniae* (Sebastiano Pauli, ed., *Codice diplomatico del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano, oggi di Malta*, 2 vols., Lucca, 1733–37, II, no. LXXVI, pp. 95–96).

admiral Jean de Monstry met the armada at sea, and destroyed or scattered all their "galiots, which are little galleys."⁷⁹

Unless a galley was immediately available for the dispatch of letters, even the most urgent correspondence might reach its destination far later than the usual assessments of distance and time might suggest. It is hard to believe that the news of a coming Mamluk offensive contained in Bérenger's letter of 1 March could have been known in Avignon when on 23 June the Venetian envoys Venier and Foscarini received a papal bull granting the Republic the right to send "four ships and eight galleys" to trade in the lands of the sultan of Egypt. The said ships and galleys were to carry only goods (or funds) belonging to Venetians and excluding all contraband such as timber, iron, or arms. The Republic was to make no treaty or other undertaking harmful either to the church or to the crusade, and the pope released both the Venetian state and its citizens from any political commitment which might have been made with the sultan's government.⁸⁰ The Senate, being well informed on eastern affairs, tried to put the license of 23 June into immediate effect, and barely a month later (on 24 July) voted to have a town crier announce from the Rialto steps that whoever wished to put a "ship, cog, or other vessel" in the coming voyages to Cyprus, Syria, and Egypt (to bring back cotton on the return) should register at the Curia within three days.⁸¹

There was need of haste, for the following month envoys from Peter I of Cyprus appeared in Avignon, and asked Urban to suspend the commercial grace he had granted Venice, which he did (on 17 August, 1366), because of the war which then existed between the Saracens and the Cypriotes and their Rhodian allies. In Urban's view this was a holy war, a crusading enterprise, but he asked the Doge Marco Corner to continue his efforts to secure from the sultan a peace or truce advantageous to the king and

the Hospitallers. The bishop of Castello (Venice) was of course instructed to publish the bull of suspension in his diocese.⁸²

War and the papal prohibitions cut severely into the profits of the Levantine trade. On 22 January, 1367, Urban authorized the Venetians to send two galleys to Mamluk territories to bring home the citizens and subjects of the Republic who were being held captive in violation of the treaties which the Venetians were supposed to have with the Egyptian government. The galleys departed for the East on 18 February, with Francesco Bembo and Domenico Michiel aboard as envoys to the sultan,⁸³ but little came of their mission for some time. Until peace was made in 1370 between Cyprus and Egypt (as we shall see), commercial trips to Syria as well as to the Nile were not without danger, although the Venetians seem to have been more acceptable in Cairo than any other Europeans. On 17 May, 1367, Urban V conceded the Republic another license, this time to send twelve galleys and four ships under the usual restrictions to Alexandria and other Mamluk ports, and in 1367 at least five galleys and one cog were sent. Four more galleys and a cog went the following year, and there was doubtless a certain amount of clandestine trade, but even after 1370 the spice trade lagged badly, although at least one galley and a cog were sent to Alexandria in 1371, four galleys and a cog in 1372, three cogs in 1373, and four more galleys in 1377.⁸⁴

Spices were in short supply, as the monks of S. Albans tell us, but the shortage of cotton was no less keenly felt. On 22 June, 1367, it was stated in the Venetian Senate that the city faced a complete lack of cotton, "which is of so great necessity for the well-being of this state." The decision was therefore taken to send, within one month, a cog of sufficient size directly to Alexandria in order to relieve this shortage, if possible, and to take immediate advantage of the last grace granted by Urban V. But of course the ship was not to be sent into Mamluk waters unless assurance came from the Venetian envoys

⁷⁹ *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 3948–81, p. 120.

⁸⁰ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 267, p. 47. On 2 July the Senate was prepared to send four new galleys, then in the Arsenal, "on the voyage to Alexandria" (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 141^r bis and ff.).

⁸¹ Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 3^v: ". . . Vadit pars in bona gracia quod cridetur in scalis Rivoalti quod quicumque vult ponere navem, cocham, vel aliud navigium ad viagium Cipri et Sorie et Egyptu pro eundo ad levandum et caricandum de gothono pro conducendo illud Venecias debeat facere se scribi ad curiam maiorem usque ad tres dies proximos. . . ."

⁸² Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 273–74, pp. 48–49, both bulls dated 17 August, 1366.

⁸³ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 319, pp. 55–56. Two more galleys were sent for the same purpose on 2 June, 1368 (*ibid.*, no. 421, p. 71).

⁸⁴ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 267, 351, pp. 47–48, 61.

in Cairo that an entente had been reached between them and the soldan's government.⁸⁵

In the meantime the Venetians wished to steer clear of the war in the eastern Mediterranean. On 22 and 25 August, 1366, the Senate voted not to allow the transport of arms and horses to Cyprus in ships of the Republic, and instructed their bailie on the island to forbid any citizen or subject of the Republic to serve in the armada which Peter I was assumed to be preparing against the Mamluks. At the same time, however, they authorized the expenditure of 600 ducats for the purchase of falcons for the emir Yelbogha, who was a great huntsman and the power behind the soldan's uncertain throne.⁸⁶ On 15 October (1366) Pope Urban protested indignantly to the doge and commune of Venice against the Senate's deplorable decrees, which would increase immeasurably the difficulties of transporting men, arms, timber, horses, food, fodder, and other essentials to the embattled defenders of the faith on the threatened islands of Cyprus and Rhodes.⁸⁷

But if the Venetian government relented, where were the subsidies coming from to lease

ships, hire men, and buy arms? Envoys of Peter I were then at the Curia Romana, and as they were getting ready to return to Cyprus, Urban gave them a letter (dated 23 October) to take back to the king. The pope lamented that he could not send Peter the substantial assistance he had sought,

for we know, my dearest son, that you proceeded magnificently against the Saracens, impious enemies of our sacred faith, with heavy expense to yourself and peril to your own person. Enheartened by the grace of our Savior, whose cause you embraced, like a strong lion and a fearless athlete, you launched an attack upon the Saracen multitude, and although you gained over them a victory, in which your courage exceeded your strength, you could not hold the city of Alexandria . . . because of insuperable obstacles. . . .

Urban acknowledged that Peter deserved all the more aid since his kingdom had now been placed in greater jeopardy than ever before. But as the Cypriote envoys had been told at the Curia, the terrible scourge of the free companies and the prevalence of war in Europe were draining the resources of Christendom. Neither the clergy nor the laity could provide Peter with the subsidies which everyone knew he needed. At this time too the commotion and expense of the Curia's projected return to Rome were beginning to weigh on the pope's mind, and he saw no alternative to an "honorable and otherwise suitable peace or truce with the soldan" to remove Cyprus and Rhodes from the danger to which they seemed to be exposed. He had suspended the licenses (*gratiae*) to trade in the lands of the Saracens, which he had granted before the arrival of the Cypriote envoys. The Venetians and Genoese, "whom we love sincerely, and whose services we shall soon need," were aggrieved, but the suspension would remain in force as long as the pope thought necessary. In the meantime, Urban said, he had issued an appeal in the West for military aid for Cyprus, and he would grant the crusading indulgence to all who went or sent others to fight the Moslems on Peter's behalf.⁸⁸

Peter was outraged by the stand the Venetians were taking, and on 23 November (1366) he wrote the Doge Marco Corner in almost violent remonstrance against the edict prohibiting the use of Venetian shipping to carry men

⁸⁵ Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 56r, dated 22 June, 1367: "Capta: Quia in totum deffecerunt gothoni in Veneciis, qui sunt tante necessitatis pro bono istius terre, ut notum est, et superinde necessario expediat providere, vadit pars quod in bona gracia deputetur ad viagium Alexandrie una cocha, que sufficientior videbitur isti consilio, et debeat recedere de Veneciis usque diem XXII mensis Iulii proximi ad longius, et vadat directe in Alexandriam, et sit dicta cocha de numero navium nuper nobis concessarum per dominum papam [on 17 May, as noted above], sed tamen non recedat de Veneciis nisi primo habitis novis a nostris ambaxatoribus qui iverunt ad soldanum de concordio facto inter nos et soldanum predictum." On the Alexandrian trade (and the perils thereof), note, *ibid.*, fols. 70r, 71r, 82r, 83r ff., 99r, 130r, 131r ff., 138r, 139r.

⁸⁶ Misti, Reg. 32, fols. 5v-6r, published in Mas Latrie, II (1852), 285-86, with incorrect folio reference, and cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), p. 327. The papal prohibition of 17 August was not yet known in Venice when on the twenty-fifth the Senate was planning the dispatch of the four ships and some galleys to Alexandria (*ibid.*, fol. 6r, not in Mas Latrie): "Capta quod committatur capitaneo galearum Alexandrie quod applicato ipso in partibus Alexandrie statim mittere debeat unum sufficientem nuncium ad presentiam Jolboge, notificando ei de adventu galearum nostrarum et consulis nostri ad dictas partes . . .," and every effort was to be made to have Yelbogha issue orders that Venetians and their goods were to be well treated and protected in Alexandria, Damascus, Beirut, and Tripoli. Cf., *ibid.*, fols. 8r, 10r, 11, 12r, 13r.

⁸⁷ Mas Latrie, II, 288-89, misdates the papal letter 1367; it should be 1366, as in Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 296, p. 51. Cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 338-39, and Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (1948), 342.

⁸⁸ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, no. 13, vol. VII (1752), p. 135.

and arms to Cyprus. On one occasion the Venetians had even forced ashore a ship loaded with arms which Cypriote agents had purchased for his use in the war against the Moslems. To impede his efforts to export arms and transport men to his island kingdom, the Venetian government had also used the pretext that they did not know who the king's legal representative in their city was, although members of their own Council had stood in the very presence of the late doge, Lorenzo Celsi, when with the latter's consent Peter had appointed as his representative his friend Federico Corner (in whose palace on the Grand Canal he was then staying). The irate king saw in the offensive edict evidence of Venetian rancor and vindictiveness, the reaction of tradesmen to the papal abrogation of their license to trade with Egypt and Syria. He could not reconcile their present attitude with the celebrations they had held in his honor when he was in Venice, and frankly alluded to the edict as appeasement of the soldan, to the detriment of Christianity and the crusade, so that Venetian galleys might ply the seas in safety as the merchants sought profit among the Moslems. He was delaying his own departure from Famagusta with a fleet so that Venetian galleys then in Mamluk waters should suffer neither harm nor loss. But he certainly hoped that the Venetians would soon revoke the scandalous edict, return to the noble path of their crusading fathers, and help him with ships and men to win the Holy Land, "which the Christians used to hold."⁸⁹

Machaeras reports that, after futile efforts to make peace with Egypt, Peter I had gathered at Famagusta by late November, 1366, a fleet of 116 sail, including 56 galleys, of which the master of the Hospital had contributed four. Peter apparently sailed on Sunday, 17 January (1367), with the intention of raiding the Syrian coast. A storm scattered the fleet, but the Gascon knight Florimont de Lesparre and the commanders of fourteen other galleys landed at Tripoli (Ṭarābulus), and sacked the town.⁹⁰ The

soldan's government renewed negotiations for peace, to which Peter responded favorably since he was being pressed by the Venetians, Genoese, and Catalans, but Cairo was in a turmoil. Yelboghha had been killed by a cabal of Mamluk emirs in December, 1366, and protracted negotiations for peace again came to nothing.⁹¹

Peter I had become a legend in Europe as well as in the Levant. In a well-known letter of 20 July, 1367 (*Sen.* VIII, 8), Petrarch heaps praise on him for the conquest of Alexandria, which might have redounded to the advantage and expansion of Christianity if as much enterprise had been shown in holding the city as in taking it. Report had it, however, that the failure was not Peter's, but that of his forces, which being composed of northerners (*transalpini*) were better at starting things than finishing them. They had deserted him in the very midst of his extraordinary venture, and had followed him not from piety but from cupidity. Having collected their spoils, they had abandoned Alexandria; leaving him powerless to ful-

Mas Latrie (1893), p. 76, both put Peter's departure on 17 January, which did fall on a Sunday. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 4332-37, p. 131, says that Peter was ill and confined to his chamber through almost all the month of November, 1366. Amadi, *Chronique*, ed. Mas Latrie (1891), pp. 415-16, states that Peter's fleet numbered 116 sail, *videlicet galie LVI, nave et altri navigli LX* (the same figures as Machaeras gives), but dates Peter's embarkation at Famagusta on 6 June (1366), as does Florio Bustron, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, ed. Mas Latrie (1886), pp. 263-64, who provides Peter with "una bellissima et potente armata de galee 56, nave, fuste, et altri navigli 60, che in tutto furono 126"(!). On the figures in Machaeras, note Dawkins, II, 119-20, and on the discovery by E. Kriaras of a third MS. of Machaeras in the Biblioteca Classense in Ravenna (Cod. 187), see Franz Dölger, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLIX (1956), 451.

⁹¹ Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 192-93, 196-205, pp. 172, 174, 176-78. Peter's enthusiasm for peace had apparently been rather limited since, according to a letter of Philippe de Mézières, he had demanded of the Egyptians (in June, 1366) the return of the kingdom of Jerusalem as his Lusignan heritage, the liberation of Christian captives and the restoration of their goods, the expulsion of his enemies from Mamluk territories, and the exemption of Cypriote merchants and their agents from all customs duties (Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 321-22, and "Une Collection de lettres de Philippe de Mézières," *Revue historique*, XLIX [1892], 49-51, and cf. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 4141 ff., pp. 125 ff.; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 339-40).

On the Cairenes' pretense of making peace to gain time for the preparation of their fleet, and on Yelboghha's death, see Weil, *Gesch. d. Chalifen*, IV (1860), 517-18, 542; Herzsohn, *Der Überfall Alexandrien's* (1886), pp. 43-44; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 361-62; Machaut, vv. 6097 ff., pp. 185 ff.

⁸⁹ Mas Latrie, II, 286-88. Parts of the Latin text defy translation.

⁹⁰ *Recital*, ed. Dawkins (1932), I, bk. II, pars. 189-91, pp. 168-72. The best MS. of Machaeras's Cypriote Greek text (in Venice, in the Bibl. Nazionale Marciana, Class. VII, cod. XVI, fol. 69^v) reads to the effect that Peter sailed on Sunday, 7 January, but in 1367 this date fell on a Thursday. The second MS. of Machaeras (at Oxford, in the Bodleian, Selden Supra 14) and Strambaldi, *Chronique*, ed. René de

fill his reverent vow, they had gratified their own lowly desire for gain.

But if Peter had been frustrated at the mouths of the Nile, he still had a wide scope for his crusading zeal. In late September (1367) he led another raid on Tripoli. The Cypriotes pillaged the place once more, but were almost destroyed in a Saracen ambush as they made their way in disorder from the town back to their galleys about a mile away in the harbor. Thereafter the fleet went on to Tortosa (Ṭartūs), sacked the Moslem settlement, and ravaged the countryside. Here they burned piles of oars and stores of pitch and tow, which were intended for some of the sultan's hundred galleys (mentioned in Bérenger's letter), and tossed nails and quantities of iron into the sea. Next they burned Valania (Bāniyās), but could not land at Laodicea (Latakia, al-Lādhīqīyah) because of a storm. They continued north to Ayas, which the Italians knew as Ajazzo or Lajazzo, on the Gulf of Alexandretta, "and killed many Saracens," but decided not to storm the well-defended inland castle. On 5 October the fleet returned to Famagusta; it had been a busy week. Still allegedly incensed at the unwillingness of the Egyptian government to make peace, Peter made Famagusta a center for privateers, two of whom promptly raided Sidon (Ṣaidā'), where they seized three merchantmen, and captured another Saracen vessel on their way back to Cyprus, "to the glory of the Holy Cross."⁹²

King Peter believed that the stalemate in the East, which was almost as bad for the merchants of Famagusta as for the Venetians and Genoese, could be broken only by another large-scale expedition against Mamluk Egypt. After some difficulty in raising the necessary money, he set out from Paphos toward the end of the year 1367, and after a stop at Rhodes, he went on to Naples, where Joanna I entertained him for several days. Thence he proceeded to Rome, to which Urban V and the Curia had returned in mid-October. He wanted to meet the challenge and the charges of Florimont de Lesparre, who had clashed with him the preceding summer. At the Curia, Peter and Florimont were reconciled (on Peter's terms),⁹³ but of course the

king's chief purpose in coming to the Curia was to seek assistance for his crusading activities.

Peter appears to have received the usual promises from the European princes, and now his erstwhile enemy Florimont urged the pope as well as the princes to support the crusade. From Rome Peter went on to Siena, where he made a royal entrance in early June (1368). His next stop was Pisa, where he arrived on 14 June, and remained three days as the honored guest of the commune. He was fêted in Lucca, and by way of Pistoia and Prato he made his way to Florence, where jousts were held in his honor. At Bologna he met the French chronicler Jean Froissart, and consulted with the pope's brother Anglic de Grimoard, cardinal-bishop of Albano, who had been appointed vicar-general of the papal states some months before.⁹⁴ Leaving Bologna on 10 July, Peter proceeded to Ferrara, where he expected to meet the Emperor Charles IV, whom he found at Mantua, and may have accompanied back to Ferrara and Modena, where the imperial entourage arrived on 4 August.⁹⁵ He was on his way to Venice, where we shall find him presently, and whence he planned to sail for Cyprus. Meanwhile Venice, Genoa, and other Italian states had been pressing for peace at the

to meet Florimont in a duel, which would be a derogation of royal dignity and a source of satisfaction to the Saracens and Turks (Lecacheux and Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 3, no. 2567, p. 450). The quarrel between Peter and Florimont looms large in the chroniclers (Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 7380-7935, pp. 224-45, with an exchange of acrimonious letters between them; Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, par. 206, p. 188, and II, 122-23; Amadi, pp. 417, 418; Strambaldi, pp. 85-87; and Florio Bustron, pp. 266-67). Peter arrived in Rome in March, 1368 (É. Baluze and G. Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914-22, I, 366, 389), and was still there on 20 May (Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l'île de Chypre*, II, 241, note, and esp. pp. 302-8).

⁹⁴ Aug. Theiner, ed., *Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis S. Sedis*, II (1862, repr. 1964), doc. CCCXXXI, pp. 450-52, dated 15 November, 1367; Lecacheux and Mollat, I, fasc. 3, no. 2511, pp. 441-43, and note nos. 2516-17, 2522, 2530-31, 2535-59, 2618, 2659 ff., 2701, 2713-14, and 2719. Anglic succeeded the rather incompetent Androin de la Roche.

⁹⁵ On Peter's itinerary in Italy, see Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 370-79, with refs., and cf. Machaeras, I, bk. II, par. 217, p. 198, who says that Peter also went to Milan, and helped restore peace between the pope and Bernabò Visconti (cf. Amadi, p. 418; Strambaldi, p. 87; and Florio Bustron, p. 267); Mas Latrie, II, 313, who gives an extract from the chronicle of Marchionne di Coppo Stefani relating to Peter's visit to Florence.

⁹² *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 210-13, pp. 190-94, and cf. II, 123-25; Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 6748-7161, pp. 205-17; Amadi, pp. 417-18; Strambaldi, pp. 84-85; and Florio Bustron, pp. 265-66; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 364-69; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 352-54.

⁹³ On 4 December, 1367, Urban had forbidden Peter

Curia,⁹⁶ and since the pope saw no prospect of financing an anti-Mamluk or an anti-Turkish expedition,⁹⁷ owing to the discord in Europe,⁹⁸ Peter agreed to put no obstacle in the path of the peacemakers.⁹⁹

In the meantime Genoese privateers had captured a merchantman from Tripoli (on the Barbary coast) as it tried to leave the harbor of Alexandria, and brought it with all its cargo into Famagusta (on 1 April, 1368). A Cypriote raiding party descended upon Sarepta (Şarāfand), on the Palestinian coast between Acre and Caesarea; they pillaged the town, and carried off all the inhabitants into the usual servitude (on Easter Sunday, 9 April). Machaeras states that the soldan's government now tried to repay the Cypriotes in kind, and sent out "two galleys from Morocco" (β' κάτερρα μαγραπίτικα)—Strambaldi says they were from "Arabi"—to attack the coast of Peter's kingdom; they captured a Venetian ship, and hauled her off with crew and cargo to Alexandria. The Genoese then seized a richly laden Saracen ship outside the harbor of Damietta, and brought her into Famagusta,¹⁰⁰ where slaves and merchandise were doubtless selling at high prices.

But if prices were high, it was obvious that privateering and war were destructive of trade. The chroniclers say that, standing in the papal presence, Peter authorized the Venetians and the Genoese, who had sent envoys to him in Rome, to arrange peace with the soldan of Egypt, and he was still in the city on 19 and 20 May when he declared that he would observe inviolably such a peace (*concordia*) "provided the said soldan shall also have been willing to observe it." But Peter demanded extra-territorial rights and a reduction in export and

import duties for all true Cypriote subjects throughout Mamluk territories. He wanted guarantees of surety for men and goods in cases of shipwreck, and agreed that the penalties for attempting to defraud either the Cypriote or Saracen customs should be the same (*ius duplum commercii solvere*). Fares and freight rates between Cyprus and Mamluk territories were to be the same for Christians and Saracens except when established by prior contract. Dishonest brokers, Saracen and Christian alike, who defrauded their principals of money or goods, would expose their own property to confiscation and sale to satisfy the claims of their creditors. Turks at war with Cyprus were not to be revictualled or harbored in Mamluk territories, and Peter would not henceforth allow corsairs and privateers (*adapides*) the use of Cypriote ports for their activities against the soldan's subjects. Peter's relatives, "familiaris," and servitors, when carrying royal visas, were to be allowed free access to the holy places in Palestine. A tribunal of Venetians, Genoese, and Catalans was to settle differences which might arise between Peter and the soldan, and if settlement should prove impossible, the aggrieved party was to declare the abrogation of the peace and allow a year to pass, *incipiendo die diffidacionis*, before making war upon the other, who was in his turn to wait a year before attacking his opponent. The Hospitallers were to be included in the peace, and Philippe de Mézières and Guido da Bagnolo di Reggio were among the witnesses to the royal letters patent which set forth the king's terms.¹⁰¹

At the same time (20 May, 1368) Peter issued another letter patent in which he stated that at the behest of Pope Urban V he was accepting Venetian and Genoese mediation to arrange a "concord" between Cyprus and Egypt. It was to be clearly understood, however, that this peace was in no way to constitute a derogation or renunciation of his rights to the kingdom of Jerusalem, which he intended fully to maintain. Captives were to be released both in Egypt and in Cyprus. Fifty Cypriotes, identified by royal letters as the king's familiaris, were to be allowed each year to make the pilgrimage to the Holy Land without payment of tribute or any other impediment.

Peter wished to be compensated for the expenses of his recent campaigns against

⁹⁶ Cf. Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 7266–82, p. 221; Amadi, p. 419; Strambaldi, p. 87; Florio Bustron, p. 267.

⁹⁷ Always anxious to pursue the unfinished business of church union with the Byzantine Emperor John V, Urban had written him from Avignon on 25 January, 1366, offering to form a coalition of the kings of Cyprus and Hungary—together with Amadeo VI of Savoy, who would soon be going east "with a large band of nobles"—to proceed against the emperor's *capitales hostes*, the Saracens and Turks: in return for this assistance John was to restore the Byzantine Church "ad obedientiam et unitatem Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae" (Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, nos. 1–2, vol. VII [1752], p. 129).

⁹⁸ Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 7222–43, pp. 219–20.

⁹⁹ Machaeras, I, bk. II, pars. 214–18, pp. 194–200; Strambaldi, p. 87; Machaut, *Prise d'Alexandrie*, vv. 7244–65, pp. 220–21.

¹⁰⁰ Machaeras, I, bk. II, pars. 219–222, pp. 200, 202; Strambaldi, pp. 87–88.

¹⁰¹ Mas Latrie, II, 291–302, with a summary of the text in Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 425, p. 72.

Mamluk Syria, since he had been obliged to go to war after the soldan had refused to ratify the treaty of peace which he had himself requested. Cypriote consuls, with the usual consular rights, were to be granted residence in all Mamluk ports and trading centers, and Cypriote merchants who had paid their tax (*dricum*) were to be allowed to store their merchandise in their houses and to sell to whom and when they chose. Among other commercial stipulations, Peter wanted a Cypriote khan or *fondaco* to be built in Alexandria as a "common habitation" for his subjects. Some of his other requirements for peace had already been outlined in his public letter of 19 May, and Peter now granted the Venetian and Genoese envoys, who were going to represent him in Cairo, some leeway in dealing with the soldan's government, but they were not to commit him to any compromise or convention he had not specified his willingness to undertake. Also if the envoys found that his brother John, prince of Antioch and then regent in Cyprus, had already begun negotiations for a settlement with the soldan's government, they were to assist and in no way to hinder the achievement of some advantage for Cyprus. Mézières and Guido da Bagnolo witnessed this document too, which like the public letter of the previous day received the impression of the king's great seal.¹⁰²

The Genoese chose Cassano Cigalla as their envoy to Cairo, and the Venetians, Niccolò Giustinian. Peter wrote his brother John to be prepared to set free the Saracen captives (then imprisoned at Kyrenia) when Cigalla and Giustinian should request their release. According to Machaeras, the envoys broke their voyage at Rhodes, and sailed from the Hospitaller stronghold on 25 June (1368), making directly for Alexandria, where emirs hostile to the idea of peace with Cyprus succeeded in frustrating their mission, to Peter's extreme annoyance.¹⁰³

Peter was going home. His stay in Italy had been useless. At the end of July or the beginning of August he had gone to Venice, where on 27 July the Senate had granted him permission to export 250 horses to Cyprus in ships of the

Republic.¹⁰⁴ On 17 August the Senate allowed him to purchase 2,000 *stellae remorum* from the Arsenal as well as 1,500 ducats' worth of arms to send back to Cyprus. Given the heat and humidity of August, Peter preferred Treviso to the Grand Canal, and on the twenty-first the Senate instructed the podestà and captain of Treviso and the rectors of Ceneda to receive him with appropriate honors. The Republic also agreed to allow him to sail from the lagoon "in our ships and in his own" with a suite of 300 persons, provided he did so before the end of September.¹⁰⁵

Peter sailed from Venice on 23 September,¹⁰⁶ and Machaut indicates that he returned home with the intention of renewing the war with the Saracens and with the expectation of claiming the crown of the "bon royaume d' Ermenie," for the Armenians had just elected him their king.¹⁰⁷ But Peter never got to Armenia, because on a Wednesday morning before daybreak, 17 January, 1369, he was murdered in his bed-chamber by a trio of disaffected Cypriote barons.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 136^r, dated 27 July, 1368: "Capta: Cum nuper comparuerit coram dominio quidam nuntius domini regis Cipri cum litteris credulitatis inter alia requirens quod iuxta formam pactorum possit extrahi facere de Veneciis equos CCL pro opportunitate sue insule, vadit pars quod concedatur. . . ."

¹⁰⁵ Misti, Reg. 32, fols. 139^v-140^r, published in Mas Latrie, II, 312. On 29 August, 1368, the Senate allowed Peter to arm his galley in Venice, "quia complacetur domino regi Cipri quod possit armari facere hic in Veneciis galeam suam cum qua vult redire in Ciprum eundo in societate cum galeis nostris. . . ." (*ibid.*, fol. 142^r).

¹⁰⁶ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 381 and 383, note 2.

¹⁰⁷ *Prise d' Alexandrie*, vv. 7314-57, 7936-55, pp. 222-24, 245-46 (Machaut, v. 7353, erroneously states that Peter left Venice on 28 September), and cf. Mas Latrie, II, 241, note, 310-11. Peter presumably learned of the failure of the negotiations for peace with Egypt in the course of his return voyage to Cyprus (cf. Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 359-60). On Peter's return to Cyprus, note Machaeras, I, bk. II, pars. 244, 246-47, pp. 224, 226, and for the details of his sojourn in Italy in 1368, see Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 369-81.

¹⁰⁸ Machaut, *Prise d' Alexandrie*, vv. 8592-8769, pp. 266-71; Amadi, pp. 425-26; Strambaldi, pp. 112-14; Florio Bustron, pp. 274-76; G. W. Coopland, ed., *Le Songe du vieil pèlerin [de Philippe de Mézières]*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1969, I, 259; Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 371, 390; Mas Latrie, II, 332-45; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 385-91, 394-95, note 5; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 360-68. When he got back home, Peter seems to have deviated into paranoia. One act of senseless tyranny and cruelty led to another, and finally to his violent death, as described at length by Machaeras, *Recital*, ed. Dawkins, I, bk. II, pars. 259-81, pp. 238-68, and II, 137-38, and on the personal, financial, and juridical

¹⁰² Mas Latrie, II, 302-8; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 426, p. 72.

¹⁰³ Machaeras, *Recital*, I, bk. II, pars. 223-30, pp. 204-12; Amadi, p. 419; Strambaldi, pp. 89-92; Florio Bustron, pp. 267-68; Peter's letter to John of Lusignan is given in Mas Latrie, II, 308, dated 20 May, 1368, and summarized in Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 434, p. 73, where it is misdated 20 June.

The death of the Christian champion, who was succeeded by his young son Peter II, was naturally no inducement to the Egyptian government to make peace with Cyprus. When the Genoese envoy Cassano Cigalla reported to the new king's uncle John, prince of Antioch and still regent of Cyprus, the failure to reach an accord, John licensed privateers again to prey on Moslem shipping going into Mamluk ports, and more plunder was unloaded on the spacious docks of Famagusta. John also armed four galleys, which attempted a raid on Sidon (Ṣaidā) on 5 June, 1369, but after a day-long encounter with the Saracens, the Cypriotes were diverted from their objective by a storm. They went on to Beirut (Bairūt), where they were dissuaded from making an attack by the two defense towers which then stood like sentinels at the entrance to the harbor.

Continuing northward, they effected landings at Botron (al-Batrūn) and Tortosa (Ṭartūs), and pillaged both places. They laid waste the coastland as far as Laodicea (al-Lādhiqīyah), where once more strong defense towers rendered them averse to the dangers of an assault. On Sunday, 17 June, they hove in sight of Lajazzo (Ayas) in Armenia, which escaped depredation, says Machaeras, "because of the large garrison it had" (διὰ τὸν πολλὸν λαὸν τὸν εἶχεν). They spent three days at Port de Palli, about ten miles southwest of Lajazzo,¹⁰⁹ and then went on to Adalia (Antalya), where the galleys were recaulked with pitch, which they got from nearby Gōrigos. Presently they set out for Alexandria, where on 9 or 10 July they penetrated the harbor defenses. The Mamluks still declined to discuss peace, and the Cypriotes suffered severe casualties in a vain effort to seize a large Moroccan merchantman (μεγάλῃ νάβα μαγραπίτικῃ) in the Old Harbor. Bypassing Rosetta, the Cypriotes returned to Sidon, where they landed again (on 19 July), defeating an attempt of the garrison to ward them off, but were driven back to their galleys once more by a storm. They sailed on to Beirut, and then northwest to Famagusta, where they cast anchor on 22 July, after seven adventurous,

destructive, and somewhat frustrating weeks.¹¹⁰

In the meantime the difficulties they had encountered in trying to arrange a peace had led the Genoese and Venetian tradesmen to take an aggressive stance against the slippery government in Cairo. On 2 July, 1369, the Doge Gabriele Adorno and the Anziani of Genoa appointed commissioners to discuss their common problem with the Doge Andrea Contarini and the commune of Venice.¹¹¹ On the twenty-sixth Urban V, who was then at Montefiascone, promulgated a bull authorizing the two doges to form an alliance and make war against the soldan of "Babylon," who had seized at Alexandria and in Syria citizens of the republics and their goods as well as pilgrims of other nations and their possessions.¹¹² On the following day, the twenty-seventh, Urban issued another bull, *ad futuram rei memoriam*, forbidding all Christians to trade with the Saracens and annulling all "graces" which had been granted for such trade. Those who violated the papal prohibitions exposed themselves to excommunication and their ships and goods to confiscation, to the advantage of any naval hunters who might seize them. Urban also granted the plenary indulgence accorded to crusaders to all who with a contrite heart should join the expedition.¹¹³

At Montefiascone, on 28 July (1369), the Veneto-Genoese alliance was solemnized in the convent of the Friars Minor under the watchful eyes of Cardinal Marco da Viterbo. It was to last until Christmas, 1370, and each of the parties was to furnish two armed galleys, which were to sail from their home ports for Rhodes the following month. When the squadron was united, the command was to alternate each day between a Venetian and a Genoese captain. The galleys were to make for Alexandrian waters, where they were to remain until the end of November, seizing whatever subjects of the soldan and Saracen property they could. If the Saracens decided to free the Venetian and Genoese captives and to restore their goods, the captains could act as seemed expedient, but neither party was to negotiate a separate peace with

grievances of the Cypriote barons against Peter, see Jean Richard, "La Révolution de 1369 dans le royaume de Chypre," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, CX (1952), 108–23.

¹⁰⁹ On the location of Port de Palli, Port de Paus, Portus Pallorum, see E. G. Rey, "Les Périple des côtes de Syrie et de la Petite Arménie," *Archives de l'Orient latin*, II (1884, repr. 1964), 348–49, with map at p. 329.

¹¹⁰ Machaeras, I, bk. III, pars. 284–88, pp. 272–76; Amadi, p. 427; Strambaldi, pp. 115–16; Florio Bustron, p. 277.

¹¹¹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 506, pp. 82–83.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, III, bk. VII, no. 509, p. 83.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 510, p. 83.

Cairo, and until a general peace was established, neither party would trade with the soldan's subjects nor allow other Christians to do so. The campaign of 1370 was to last from 1 May to 30 November, and provision was made for the division of the captives and booty which the galleys were expected to take. Both parties bound themselves to payment of a penalty of 20,000 gold florins for failure to abide by the articles of this convention.¹¹⁴ On 29 July the pope directed Raymond Bérenger, master of the Hospital, and invited John of Lusignan, regent of Cyprus, to join the alliance against the Saracens.¹¹⁵ Venetian galleys were of course to continue their commercial runs to Crete and Cyprus.¹¹⁶ On 31 August the goods of Egyptian and Syrian subjects of the soldan were sequestered to the extent that the Venetian government had access to them.¹¹⁷

Little or nothing came of the Veneto-Genoese alliance. The rival republics were not likely to collaborate very seriously in making war on the Mamluks, with whom they wanted to resume their commercial ties. The Venetians and Genoese, therefore, as well as the Cypriotes and Hospitallers, renewed their efforts—*tantas componere lites*—to reach an understanding with the soldan's government in Cairo. There were long delays and further bickering. Urban V, however, was preoccupied with the affairs of Italy and with his vain attempt to re-establish the papacy in Rome. No one could see another crusade on the horizon. Machaeras states that, when a Latin mission went to Cairo in August, 1370, the soldan first learned that Peter I was dead, and that the Cypriotes could expect no further help from Europe, "and he felt pity for us [*καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίστην μας*], and wanted to conclude the peace,"¹¹⁸ which would seem to be one of the least likely assertions in his entire chronicle. But the Mamluk government, then rent by internal discord, had doubtless suffered enough from Cypriote raids, and so in the fall of 1370 the soldan of Egypt swore on the Koran, and the prince regent of Cyprus on the Gospels, to maintain the peace they had at long length

agreed to, in earnest and with lawful authority, says Machaeras, without evil intent or deception.¹¹⁹

Although the text of this treaty seems not to be extant, its general contents may perhaps be gathered from Peter I's letters patent of May, 1368, but the Mamluks had no intention of yielding to the dead king's sweeping demands. The Hospitallers were of course included in the treaty, certain provisions of which may also be inferred from the charge given to Raymond de Lescure, the prior of Toulouse, in November, 1403, when he went to Cairo to secure ratification of another accord with the Mamluks, which was first of all to establish the fact "that the peace which was made after the taking of Alexandria should be maintained and observed for all free peoples, as is contained in the articles which were then composed." Among these articles were apparently stipulations providing for three months' notice (not a year) before the resumption of hostilities, the restoration of the Latin consulates in Mamluk territories, the right of Christian pilgrims to go to the Holy Sepulcher and to the monastery of S. Catherine in the valley below Mount Sinai, and the establishment of customs duties at fixed rates, which doubtless varied from Alexandria to Damascus.¹²⁰ After five years of warfare and piracy, Latin trade was resumed in the Mamluk ports of Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, but the memory of the sack of Alexandria was not to be forgotten or forgiven.

The chancellor Philippe de Mézières had played no part in the negotiations which led to peace between Cyprus and Egypt, and which destroyed his hopes for a great crusade to crush the Mamluks and regain the Holy Land. He was in Venice when he first learned of Peter I's death, and he neither desired nor dared to return

¹¹⁹ *Recital*, I, bk. III, pars. 290–309, pp. 278–96; Amadi, pp. 428–29; Strambaldi, pp. 117–25; Florio Bustron, pp. 277–80; Mas Latrie, II, 347–50; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 397–402; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 374–76.

¹²⁰ Pauli, *Codice diplomatico del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano*, II (1737), no. LXXXVI, pp. 108–10: "Et primierement que la paix, qui fu faicte apres la prince d'Alixandre, soit gardee et observee a toutes generacions franx, selon quelle est contenue es chapitres qui en furent fait" (p. 108). Pilgrims were still to pay the same *drois* as they had paid "avant la prise d'Alixandre" (for the amounts, see, *ibid.*, p. 109). Note Mas Latrie, II, 348–49; Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II, 376; and on Lescure, J. Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1886, I, 505–6.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 512, p. 84, and note nos. 513, 517–21.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 514–15, p. 85.

¹¹⁶ Misti, Reg. 33, fols. 28^v, 30^r.

¹¹⁷ Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 30^v.

¹¹⁸ *Recital*, I, bk. III, par. 303, p. 288, but Strambaldi, p. 122, says that the soldan "non ha volesto finir la pace."

to the court where accomplices in the king's murder were daily to be seen. Mézières seems to have remained on the lagoon during the years 1369–1370, turning his attention from the worldly disappointment of his past to the spiritual discipline upon which he would build his future. Having enjoyed the hospitality of the Confraternity or Scuola of S. Giovanni Evangelista (one of the six Scuole Grandi in Venice), whose church, guild hall, and hospice were near the Frari in Venice, Mézières gave the confraternity a tiny piece of the true cross. He had acquired it as a legacy from the revered Pierre Thomas, who had carried it in a jeweled processional cross during the attack upon Alexandria. Pierre had received the precious fragment from a delegation of Syrian Christians in 1360. Now, in a solemn ceremony in the Church of S. Giovanni Evangelista after mass on 23 December, 1370, Mézières removed his mantle, bared his head, and fell to his knees before a "copious multitude of people," as he presented the fragment to Andrea Vendramin, guardian of the Scuola, and to the officials and fratelli who stood by. Mézières swore that he firmly believed his gift to be "del legno medemo sopra il qual in croce ha patito Jesu signor nostro."¹²¹

¹²¹ The text of a notarized, eyewitness account of the ceremony is given by Louis de Mas Latrie, "Nouvelles Preuves de l'histoire de Chypre," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXXIV (1873), 75–76, note, from the *Vita del*

This fragment of the true cross was to figure prominently in religious processions throughout the following century, and is still preserved at the Scuola in a silver reliquary (in a recess over the altar) in the Hall of the Cross. In the years just before and after 1500 some of the chief Venetian artists of the time—Gentile Bellini, Vittore Carpaccio, Giovanni Mansueti, and Lazzaro Bastiani—painted enormous canvases for the Scuola, depicting the miracles which the relic had performed in Venice. After the establishment of the Accademia in the complex of buildings at S. Maria della Carità (in the early nineteenth century), all these canvases were finally removed to the Academy Gallery, including Bastiani's painting of the ceremony in which Philippe de Mézières gave the Venetians his chief treasure. Recently cleaned and restored, these paintings hang together in a special room (built for them in 1940), but among the many thousands who see them every year, there are few for whom the name of Philippe de Mézières can have much meaning.

glorioso S. Giovanni apostolo ed evangelista, con alcuni miracoli della santissima croce che conservasi nella scuola grande di detto santo, avuto in dono fino dall' anno 1370, Venice, 1752; Iorga, Philippe de Mézières, pp. 393–94, 402–3; Boehlke, Pierre de Thomas (1966), pp. 280, 301–2. There is a brief history of the church and its artistic treasures by G. M. Urbani de Gheltof, Guida storico-artistica della Scuola di S. Giovanni Evangelista in Venezia, Venice, 1895, 72 pp., with eight documents.

13. THE CRUSADE OF AMADEO VI OF SAVOY, JOHN V PALAEOLOGUS IN ROME AND VENICE (1366–1371)

ALTHOUGH the Christian occupation of Smyrna (in 1344) and that of Adalia (in 1361) caused excitement in the chanceries of Europe, the sack of Alexandria was to remain the crusading event of the century. We have already had occasion to note the deferred plans of Amadeo VI, the Green Count of Savoy, to lead an expedition against the Saracens or the Turks. Since the chroniclers and papal biographers do not mention his presence at the Curia on Good Friday, 31 March, 1363—when John II of France and Peter I of Cyprus both received the *signum crucis* at Urban V's hands¹—Iorga was led to doubt Amadeo's participation in the pageantry which attended the two kings' sojourn in Avignon.² The documents justify Iorga's misgivings, but we know that Amadeo took the cross at Avignon some time before 1 April, 1364.³

¹ Cf. Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914–22, I, 352–53, 384, 396, 400; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1363, nos. 14–18, vol. VII (Lucca, 1752), pp. 85–88; and above, p. 245a.

² N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières (1327–1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1896, p. 164, contrary to J. Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1886, I, 120, 141 (followed by A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1938, pp. 332, note, 381), who asserts that Amadeo took the cross in the ceremony on Good Friday of 1363. Pietro Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente di Amedeo VI conte di Savoia, provata con inediti documenti*, Turin, 1826, pp. 11–12, deduced Amadeo's presence in Avignon from a bull which he misdated 1 April, 1363, and thus misled Delaville Le Roulx (see the following note). Amadeo was, to be sure, in Avignon at the beginning of the French king's visit to Urban V; he arrived about 2 December, 1362, but left on the thirtieth for Savoy, where he arrived on the twentieth (see Jean Cordey, *Les Comtes de Savoie et les rois de France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans [1329–1391]*, Paris, 1911, pp. 166–70 [Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, no. 189]). There is no evidence, however, that Amadeo took the crusading vow in December, 1362.

³ Seven bulls dated 1 April, 1364 (not 1363), granting Amadeo a princely range of crusading concessions, have been published in apparently good texts by F. E. Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni della spedizione in Oriente di Amedeo VI (il Conte Verde)*, Turin, 1900, docs. vi–xii, pp. 344–67 (Biblioteca storica italiana, VI): “Cum tu in dicto passagio [ad Terram Sanctam et partes infidelium Orientis] vel ante cum tua potentia transfretare disponas, prout hoc apud Apostolicam Sedem corporaliter iuravisti et recepisti venerabile signum crucis . . .” (doc. vi, p. 344, and cf. docs. vii, ix, x, pp. 349, 354–55, 358). This work is hereafter cited as Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*. The bulls in question are all dated at Avignon *Kalendis Aprilis, pontificatus nostri anno secundo* (i.e. 1364), but unfortunately Bollati di Saint-Pierre has misdated them all a year too early: Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, pp. 225–42, had already made the same mistake.

He was in Avignon in January, 1364, when he joined a league (*colligatio*) with the count of Valentinois, the seneschal of Provence and Forcalquier, the governor of Dauphiné, and the papal rector of the Comtat-Venaissin for defense against the ravaging free companies.⁴ It is almost certain that this was the time when he took the cross,⁵ and founded the crusading Order of the Collar, “an order of fifteen knights in honor of the fifteen joys of Our Lady.”⁶

In any event, by the bulls of the following 1 April Urban V granted Amadeo all the hitherto unspent legacies, gifts, confiscations, fines, and penances which had been bequeathed, given, assigned, or levied *pro dicto passagio et Terre Sancte subsidio* in the county of Savoy and its dependencies for the preceding twelve years and for the next six. Certain unassigned funds were also to be applied to the crusade. When restitution could not be made of the profits of usury, theft, rapine, and *alia male acquisita*, such ill-gotten gains were to be used for the next six years to help finance the expedition against the Saracens, who had seized and still held the Holy Land. Repentant usurers and thieves, who dropped into Amadeo's crusading coffers the funds which could not be returned to those whom they had victimized, might be given absolution. Amadeo was also to receive a tithe of all church revenues in the county of Savoy for the next six years, excepting those of the cardinals, the Hospitallers and members of other military orders, and priests who, having obtained the necessary license, were themselves going on the crusade. One-half the tithe in a given year was to be collected on the feast of the Purifi-

⁴ Maurice Prou, *Étude sur les relations politiques du pape Urbain V avec les rois de France Jean II et Charles V (1362–1370)*, Paris, 1888, pp. 34–35 with docs. xxvii–xxviii, pp. 110–11; cf. Paul Lecacheux, ed., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V (1362–1370) se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1902), no. 847, pp. 124–25, and Eugene L. Cox, *The Green Count of Savoy: Amadeus VI and Transalpine Savoy in the Fourteenth Century*, Princeton, 1967, pp. 179–80.

⁵ See Dino Muratore, “La Nascita e il battesimo del primogenito di Gian Galeazzo Visconti e la politica viscontea nella primavera del 1366,” *Archivio storico lombardo*, 4th ser., IV (Milan, 1905), 264.

⁶ Jean Servion, *Chroniques de Savoie*, in the *Monumenta historiae patriae* (hereafter abbreviated MHP), III, *Scriptores*, I (Turin, 1840), cols. 294–96, “. . . ung ordre de quinze chivalliers en lonnour des quinze ioyez de Notre Dame,” and see Cox, *Green Count of Savoy*, pp. 180–86, 371–72.

cation of the Virgin (usually 2 February), and the other half on the feast of the Assumption (15 August).⁷

King John II of France had made it clear that he could not set out for the East before the date established for the departure of the main body of crusaders (1 March, 1365), but the pope expected Amadeo as well as Peter I of Cyprus to do so (*ante dictum terminum*).⁸ Since Amadeo needed the funds provided for in these bulls to organize his expedition, the episcopacy of Savoy and beyond was directed to proceed with the collection of the specified legacies, gifts, fines, penances, and the like "for the use of the said expedition and for the recovery of the Holy Land."⁹

On 3 July, 1365, the Apostolic Camera paid one Giovanni Bartoli, a Sienese gold- and silver-smith who lived in Avignon, 115 florins, 22 solidi *de camera* for the gold, silver, precious stones, and workmanship that went into the production of the golden rose which Urban V gave Amadeo on Laetare Sunday (23 March) in 1365. Bartoli had already received on account 80 florins of the standard of Florence, which amounted to 78 florins *de camera*.¹⁰ The golden rose signaled Amadeo's approaching service to Christendom as a crusader in the Levant, and as he prepared to set out "overseas . . . against the Saracens, Turks, and other infidels," he appointed his wife Bonne de Bourbon as "governess and administrator" of his domains. She was to receive all the revenues of the county of Savoy and its dependencies, wherein until his return she would maintain justice and tranquillity. As usual under such circumstances, Bonne was to rule

with a council, to which Amadeo named seven members, of whom two or three should always be with her when she made decisions.¹¹

Although the bulls of 1 April, 1364, had emphasized that Amadeo was going on a crusade to help recover the Holy Land¹² (in concert with Peter I of Cyprus), some doubt was now expressed at the Curia Romana as well as at the court of Savoy as to where Amadeo should really go. A crusade against the Saracens in Egypt and Syria would require extensive transport which neither the Venetians nor the Genoese would supply. The Alexandria crusade had already done more than enough damage to their trade in cotton, silk, spices, and other imports from the Levant. But the Turks of the Anatolian emirates were a constant threat to western shipping and to the Latin states in Greece, including Negroponte and the Venetian lordships in the Aegean. Smyrna was still in Latin hands, and needed protection. The poor Byzantines had been reduced to such despair by Ottoman aggression that perhaps they would now return to the warm bosom of the Latin Church if they were rescued from their plight by the crusade. Amadeo had been spending the ecclesiastical tithes for almost two years. Although his preparations had been extensive, his forces would hardly be adequate for the recovery of the Holy Land. One must employ them, however, somewhere, somehow for the good of Latin Christendom.

Louis the Great of Hungary had been talking about the crusade for more than two years, ever since Urban V had appealed to him in May, 1363. Louis wanted to see a powerful thrust push the Turks from the Balkans back into Asia Minor, and spent the winter of 1364–1365 in apparent preparation for such a campaign. In January, 1365, the Venetians learned that ten galleys were being armed for him in Provence, and that he had issued a call to arms in Zara and elsewhere in Dalmatia. The Senate be-

⁷ Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, docs. VI–VII, IX, XI–XII, pp. 344 ff.

⁸ *Ibid.*, doc. VIII, pp. 351–52, and cf. doc. XI, p. 361.

⁹ *Ibid.*, docs. VIII–IX, XII–XIII, pp. 351 ff., 365 ff., doc. XIII being dated 5 May, 1364. These bulls were addressed to the archbishops of Lyon and Tarentaise and the bishops of Mâcon, S. Jean de Maurienne, Grenoble, Belley, Geneva, Lausanne, Sion (Sitten), Aosta, Ivrea, and Turin. Charles IV had made Amadeo the imperial vicar over such of these dioceses as were not in Savoyard territory (Dela-ville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 142). On 30 June, 1364, Urban urged Amadeo to pursue "diligently" his plans for the crusade (Paul Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 2 [1906], no. 1053, p. 164).

¹⁰ K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter den Päpsten Urban V. und Gregor XI. (1362–1378)*, Paderborn, 1937, p. 126. Bartoli also received five florins for making a beaker (*picherius*) for the pope's bedchamber. Urban sent special couriers to Amadeo on 3 October, 1363, on the same date in 1364, and on 5 August, 1365, the last courier carrying with him a "certain bull" (*ibid.*, pp. 16, 69, 107).

¹¹ The legal instruments giving Bonne the *potestas regiminis* may be found in Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, docs. I–II, pp. 329–35. Bollati di Saint-Pierre has published in this volume the financial accounts of Amadeo's expedition, kept by the careful clerk Antoine Barbier from 12 June, 1366, to 22 January, 1368, "videlicet de uno anno integro et triginta duabus septimanis."

¹² Cf. Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, doc. x, p. 357: ". . . ad recuperationem Terre Sancte . . . verbum crucis mandavimus predicari omnibus transfretaturis in [generali] passagio, indulgentiam et privilegia . . . auctoritate apostolica concedentes. . . ."

came apprehensive.¹³ Louis soon announced his intention, however, of proceeding against Ladislaus, the voivode of Wallachia, who had revolted against his suzerainty; but Ladislaus, terrified by the extent of the new Hungarian armament, mended his manners; and in the spring of 1365 Louis marched against western Bulgaria, took Vidin by storm, and brought back with him to Hungary the Bulgarian prince Sračimir as a prisoner.¹⁴ During the winter of 1365–1366 Louis continued his offensive against the western Bulgarians, but when the spring came, he appeared to be ready to turn his arms against the Turks,¹⁵ presumably in co-operation with Amadeo of Savoy.

In a letter dated 25 January, 1366, to which we have already alluded, Pope Urban made what he regarded as an attractive proposal to the Byzantine Emperor John V Palaeologus. If the latter was now ready to fulfill the intention, which he had long professed, of delivering his people from schism, the Curia Romana would form an alliance of Louis of Hungary, Peter of Cyprus, and Amadeo of Savoy, "your cousin" (*consanguineus tuus*), to exalt the Latin faith in the Levant and to subdue the obdurate hostility of the impious Saracens and the abominable Turks, "your chief enemies." John was not much concerned with the Saracens. The Ottoman Turks, however, were almost at his doorstep. Amadeo was going east, the pope wrote, with a large force of nobles, and his expedition would give the Greeks the opportunity of achieving the security of their state as well as the salvation of their souls.¹⁶

¹³ Sime Ljubić, *Listine*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV (Zagreb, 1874), nos. CXXXII–CXXXIII, pp. 76–77.

¹⁴ S. Steinherz, "Die Beziehungen Ludwigs I. von Ungarn zu Karl IV. (1358–1373)," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, IX (Innsbruck, 1888), 558–59.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 567.

¹⁶ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, nos. 1–2, vol. VII (1752), p. 129. John V's father, Andronicus III (1328–1341), had married Amadeo's aunt Jeanne of Savoy, known as Anna Palaeologina, on whose influence in the Byzantine empire, see Ursula V. Bosch, *Kaiser Andronikos III. Palaiologos*, Amsterdam, 1965. Although Cox, *Green Count of Savoy*, pp. 206–7, states that on 6 January, 1366, Urban, giving up hope of seeing a large-scale crusade set forth to the East, revoked the bulls (of April, 1364) granting the sexennial tithe to Amadeo, on the twenty-seventh Urban directed the episcopate of Savoy to collect and pay Amadeo the tithe to help finance the *passagium generale* he and his troops were about to undertake (Paul Lecacheux and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape*

The Alexandria crusade had stirred the imagination of Europe, and the exploits of the king of Cyprus excited emulation. The propaganda of crusading preachers had its effect, and bourgeois and peasants alike wanted their rulers too to strike a blow for the cross. Louis the Great of Hungary appeared to be serious in his plans for a crusade. He sent two envoys to Venice to help arrange for the naval transport of some of his troops. On 10 March, 1366, Leonardo Dandolo, son of the late Doge Andrea, was commissioned to go as the Republic's representative to Louis to discuss the matter. Louis's two envoys had assured the Doge Marco Corner and the Collegio of the friendship of their king, who had just issued orders in all his domains "that the citizens and merchants of Venice should be well and favorably treated." Dandolo was to thank his Majesty for this gesture of amity.

The Hungarians had then requested permission to arm, at their king's expense, from two to five galleys in the Arsenal at Venice,

saying that it was his Majesty's intention to go personally with a great army by land and sea to the aid of the empire of Romania against the Turks, and that this was at the request and the desire of the lord emperor of Constantinople: furthermore his said ambassadors have asserted that the intention of the lord king, having considered the state of Christendom, was by no means to go into the areas of Syria and Egypt because of the very great [commercial] losses which would follow therefrom for all the world . . . , and they have ended by affirming that his royal Majesty's intention was to keep the said galleys in readiness in the waters of Adalia and at the mouth [of the Gulf] to prevent the Turks from descending [upon] Greece [and retreating therefrom] into Turkey.

Dandolo could inform the king that Venice was prepared to offer him "two or three or up to five galleys, to be armed entirely at our expense, for the period of six months, as requested on his royal Majesty's behalf." Dandolo was to remind the king that the Venetians were at peace with the emperor of Constantinople, and enjoyed certain rights and jurisdiction, pacts and fran-

Urbain V se rapportant à la France, I, fasc. 3 [Paris, n.d.], no. 2105, pp. 368–69). Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, p. 21, alludes to a bull of 27 January, 1365, revoking all the ecclesiastical concessions made to Amadeo, which led Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 141, to assume that Amadeo persisted in his plans for the eastern expedition without such financial assistance, but the grant of tithes was clearly in effect on 27 January, 1366 (and Delaville Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, proceeds to contradict himself on p. 144).

chises in the empire, and that they were also at peace with the emirs of Miletus and Ephesus (*cum dominis Palacie et Teologi*). The king should of course bear in mind that Venice would need ample notice in advance in order to prepare the galleys for such time as his Majesty might require them.¹⁷

That the doge should find it necessary to remind Louis that Venice was at peace with the Turkish emirates of Miletus and Ephesus, is quite understandable. But why remind him that Venice was at peace with Byzantium, and did not wish to see any disruption or diminution of her special privileges in the empire? Apparently the Venetian government suspected Louis's intentions on the Bosphorus, and someone in the Senate must have observed that, if the poor Greeks were going to have the Hungarians as allies, they would not need the Turks as enemies.

As the Ottoman Turks moved about on the western side of the Bosphorus, fear had taken hold of the Byzantine court, and the Emperor John V went to Buda, where he renewed his oath to accept Latin Catholicism for two of his sons as well as for himself. He promised obedience to Rome in return for defense against the Turks. It was the first time a ruling emperor of Byzantium had gone into a foreign land as a suppliant in search of military aid for his people and (as one must have said in Avignon) in search of their spiritual salvation as well. In an address of June or July, 1366, in which he urged his countrymen gratefully to accept the aid of the Latins against the Turks, Demetrius Cydones (himself a *Λατινόφρων* and convert to Catholicism) has described the hardships of the emperor's long journey to Hungary "in the dead of winter." John had left Constantinople with a small retinue, probably in January (1366), sailed along the western shores of the Black Sea to the mouths of the Danube, then up the Danube, skirting northern Bulgaria, through Vidin, and

north on the Danube and by land all the way to the Hungarian capital.¹⁸

In a long letter of 1 July, 1366, Pope Urban told the Emperor John of the reception at the Curia of the Byzantine envoy George "Magnicartes" (Manicaïtes), the imperial chancellor, and of the Hungarian envoy Stephen de Insula, bishop of Neutra (Nyitra, now Nitra), a suffragan of the see of Gran (Esztergom). They had reported, as Urban informed John,

how you have personally visited King [Louis] in his city of Buda with fraternal affection, and how with mutual good will and application you have [both] discussed your reconciliation and that of your people with the Roman Church, mother and mistress of all the faithful . . . , and you have solemnly promised the king, and confirmed with an oath, that you and your sons, the noble Manuel and Michael, would accept, discharge, and fulfill all [the dictates] which we might impose upon you and your sons, for the honor of the Roman Church and the increase of the Catholic faith.

The Christian world would rejoice in the Greeks' return to the fold.

Urban sent the emperor the *fidei formula* to which the Greeks were to subscribe, and informed King Louis that he had done so, for he wanted the king to see to it that the Greeks made a full profession of Catholic faith and a proper abjuration of their long-standing schism. When he gave the chancellor George leave to return to the emperor, Urban dispatched two nuncios of his own to the king and (if the latter approved) to the emperor. The nuncios were Guillaume de Noellet, a doctor of both laws and curial *auditor causarum*, and the Augustinian friar Rudolph of Città di Castello, a professor of theology. They would give both the Hungarians and the Greeks whatever explanations might be needed, and would see to the observance of all legal and religious details.¹⁹

¹⁷ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Lettere segrete del Collegio (1363–1366), fols. 176^v–177^r, with a faulty transcription in Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta externa*, II (Budapest, 1875), no. 479, pp. 643–45. The Hungarian envoys informed the doge and Collegio "quod intentio sue regie Maiestatis erat habere dictas galeas in mari paratas ad partes Satalie et ad bucham ad turbandum quod Turchi non possent descendere de parciibus Grece supra Turchiam." Cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 330–31. On 28 February (1366) the Senate had authorized Dandolo to borrow money, if he should find it necessary, to defray the expenses of his embassy to the Hungarian court (Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 131^v).

¹⁸ Dem. Cydones, *Oratio pro subsidio Latinorum*, in the *Patrologia graeca*, vol. 154 (Paris, 1866), cols. 1000–1, on which note Const. Jireček, in his review of the first volume of N. Iorga's *Osmanisches Reich*, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XVIII (1909), 583.

¹⁹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.* ad ann. 1366, nos. 4–9, vol. VII (1752), pp. 130–32; Wenzel, *MHH, Acta externa*, II, no. 484, pp. 650–51. Cf. Urban's letter of 1 July to Louis the Great of Hungary in Aug. Theiner, ed., *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, 2 vols., Rome, 1859–60, II, no. CXL, pp. 73–74. Noellet's safe-conduct is dated 23 July, 1366 (Lecacheux and Mollat, I, fasc. 3, nos. 2337–38, p. 408); he was also being sent to the Emperor Charles IV (*ibid.*, no. 2328, p. 406).

By a bull of the same date (1 July) addressed to the archbishops of Gran, Kalocsa, Zara, Spalato, and Ragusa, and their suffragans, Urban directed the Hungarian clergy to preach the crusade, pin the cross on the shoulders of those who were going to be useful, and grant the crusaders who accompanied King Louis the *plena suorum peccaminum venia*. As usual, the indulgence was extended to those who by their gifts of money made it possible for others to take the field against the Turks. Strong boxes (*trunci*) with three locks were to be placed in all cathedral, collegiate, and parochial churches; the faithful were to be urged to deposit their "alms" in these boxes to the extent that God should inspire them for the remission of their sins. Three locks required three keys, and (as usual) the bishop was to keep one; a prelate or priest, the second; and a layman of proven character, the third. Once a week a mass was to be said in all churches in Hungary "for the safety of the king and for the success of this sacred enterprise."²⁰ At the same time Urban addressed a crusading bull to Louis, at the latter's own request (*nobisque humiliter supplicasti*), in which he inveighed against the impious Turks, whose madness had grown with their increasing attacks upon the faithful Christians who remained steadfast in their devotion to the Latin Church (*fideles . . . in unitate Ecclesie persistentes*). Urban granted Louis and his followers the full indulgence received by crusaders who went overseas to fight for the recovery of the Holy Land,²¹ but he saw the Hungarian expedition primarily as a means of protecting Catholics in the Latin states in Greece and the islands, who had indeed remained steadfast in the faith of their fathers for a century and a half. If the Greeks derived some benefit from Louis's efforts, so much the better; though unfortunately they were schismatics, they were at least Christians. But for military operations to be conducted directly to their advantage, they must return to the protective embrace of Latin Catholicism.

When Leonardo Dandolo had fulfilled his mission, Louis wrote the doge on 20 June and

the Signoria on 24 July (1366), thanking them for their generous offer of the two to five galleys. He said that he would let them know in due time when and where the galleys should be sent for his use.²² He would also let them know, presumably, how many galleys he wanted.

At this point (on 22 June) Urban V wrote Louis a rather strange (and highly controverted) letter to the effect that, although the *negotium defensionis Grecorum* should be undertaken to assure the return of the Greeks to union with the Church of Rome, it should be done prudently and with due reflection. After all, the Greeks were a deceitful and slippery people, as many an old church chronicle would reveal, and very likely they were now taking their apparent steps toward union less of their own free will and devotion than from sheer military necessity, since Louis stood ready to help them against the Turks when they renounced the schism. One must employ caution in dealing with them. If Louis had in fact promised the emperor or his emissaries to assist them within a certain specified time, Urban now "suspended" his promise for one year, although "in the meantime you may aid them with some armed force or other, if it should seem worthwhile to you."²³

The pope's letter is hard to explain, and stands out in strong contrast to his efforts to promote the crusade, especially since John V and his sons had renewed their oaths to accept Catholicism. But it is well known that Louis and John did not get along well in their meetings at Buda, and Halecki has suggested that Louis himself may have asked for this "suspension" of a year, and the papal text may in fact reflect the terms in which Louis made the request. The pope's answer to a petition often rehearses the words of the petitioner.²⁴ Halecki's theory is almost convincing.

²⁰ Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 483, p. 650; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV, no. CXLIX, pp. 86–87; R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, III (Venice, 1883), bk. VII, no. 263, p. 47.

²¹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, no. 3, vol. VII (1752), p. 130; Theiner, *Monumenta Hungariae sacrae*, II, no. CXXXIX, p. 73: ". . . eis interim de aliqua armigera gente succurras si tibi expediens videatur." Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903, repr. New York, 1958, pp. 704–5, note, finds this letter characteristic of the papal policy of not trying to aid the schismatics against the infidels.

²² Cf. Oskar Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (1355–1375)*, Warsaw, 1930, pp. 129–32. It appears that Louis and his zealous mother Elizabeth of Poland had insisted that John and his suite receive a second baptism,

²⁰ Theiner, *Monumenta Hungariae sacrae*, II, no. CXLVI, pp. 76–79.

²¹ Theiner, *Monumenta Hungariae sacrae*, II, no. CXLII, pp. 74–75; Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 482, pp. 648–50; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1366, no. 10, vol. VII (1752), pp. 132–33. These two texts are replete with the recurring formulae employed in crusading bulls.

Through the summer of 1366, however, Louis gave every indication of continuing with his plans and preparations for the crusade. On 20 September he repeated his thanks to his *amici carissimi*, the Venetians, for their offer of "two, three, or up to five galleys armed wholly at your expense for a period of six months against the Turks." But when Louis considered the trials and burdens which the Venetians bore every day as well as their pacts with the Turks of Miletus and Ephesus, he did not want to involve them, he said, in the crusade any more than was essential. He asked to be supplied with the finished hulls (*corpora*) of five galleys and with the necessary armaments and oars; he would equip them and provide the crews and other manpower at his own expense.²⁵ In this way the Turks would presumably have no way of identifying the source of the galleys, and thus the Anatolian emirs would have no cause for complaint against Venice. With no Venetians aboard, the Republic would be hard put to keep the Hungarian crusade under surveillance.

The Venetian replies were friendly, but Louis's proposal required further negotiation, as is clear from his letters to the Doge Marco Corner of 6–7 December (1366).²⁶ By the following 5 March they had settled for two galleys with the appropriate arms and equipment.²⁷ Louis was at least as slippery as the Greeks with whom he had become disaffected, and the Venetians had probably reduced their offer to two galleys, because he had applied to his friend Francesco da Carrara for 300 foot-soldiers, whom he wished to have enter Hungary

by way of Segna (Senj) in the northeastern corner of the Adriatic. On 9 February, 1367, the Republic had reluctantly given Francesco permission to transport his men "through our waters and to rent our ships at his own expense as far as Segna."²⁸ Francesco, the friend of Petrarch, had been the first of the Carraresi to abandon the alliance of his house with Venice. He had thrown in his lot with Hungary, and turned against the Republic in the war for Dalmatia. The Venetians hated him, and usually assumed that no good could come of any enterprise with which he was connected.

Louis continued to play the part of a crusader, and in December, 1366, we find him negotiating with Ragusa to acquire a galley "to serve in the expedition going to Constantinople."²⁹ When he had first begun talk of the crusade, he may have thought of assisting the Greeks against the Turks (for an appropriate price). Having arranged for the loan of the two Venetian galleys—without the impediment of Venetian crews—Louis finally wrote the doge that he no longer wanted to use the galleys against the Turks on behalf of the Byzantine emperor. The well-informed chronicler Giangiacomo Caroldo, secretary of the Council of Ten in the early sixteenth century, summarizes the sequel for us:

His Majesty [now] had the intention of making war on the king of Serbia and the emperor of Bulgaria and perhaps on the emperor of Constantinople, since he [John V] was unwilling to observe the pacts which he had with him—which [emperor] did not cease from conspiring against his royal Majesty, having engaged in many intrigues. He [Louis] would, therefore, be very grateful for the accommodation of the galleys, to be armed at his own expense. Reply was made to his Majesty that the Venetian Republic had agreements with the emperor of Constantinople, confirmed by an oath, and that the king of Rascia or Serbia was a Venetian citizen, with whom [the Republic] had pacts and the obligation of dealing with him as a friend. And they also had a peace with the emperor of the Bulgarians, whose country Venetian merchants frequented and [in which] they traded securely. For that reason, might it please his Majesty

into the Roman Church, before receiving any aid from Hungary. The demand was unacceptable to the Greeks; it was also contrary to the canons of both Churches. See the important study by Jean Meyendorff, "Projets de concile oecuménique en 1367: Un Dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XIV (1960), 149–77, esp. pp. 154–55, 166, 173. The Hungarians, says Meyendorff, were "more papist than the pope." They were also somewhat irascible as a result of their resentment of the Bogomiles, who lived in Slavic (and some even in Byzantine) territory, on which note P. Wirth, "Die Haltung Kaiser Johannes' V. bei den Verhandlungen mit König Ludwig I. von Ungarn zu Buda im Jahre 1366," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVI (1963), 271–72.

²⁵ Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 485, pp. 651–52; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CLI, p. 88; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 284, p. 50.

²⁶ Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, nos. 486–88, pp. 652–53; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. CLIII–CLV, pp. 88–89; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, nos. 311–13, p. 54.

²⁷ Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 492, p. 655; Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CLVII, p. 90; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 337, p. 59.

²⁸ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 32^r. The document is dated "1366, die VIII Febr." (*more veneto*), i.e. 1367, and is correctly given in Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CLVI, p. 90, contrary to Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 133, note 3. The incorrect date given in Latin at the beginning of the document in Wenzel, *MHH, Acta extera*, II, no. 490, p. 654, was made up by the editor, and is no part of the original text.

²⁹ *Monumenta Ragusina*, IV, ed. Jos. Gelcich (in *MHSM*, XXVIII [Zagreb, 1896]), p. 75.

to excuse the Republic. From this discord between the king of Hungary and the emperor of Constantinople . . . the Turk then seized the fine opportunity to increase his strength and to extend his forces into Europe.³⁰

Such was the result of Louis the Great's advocacy of a crusade to sweep the Turks from the Balkan peninsula.

In the meantime Amadeo VI, the Green Count of Savoy, had been going on with his own plans for the crusade. He left the castle of Le Bourget (near Chambéry), his favorite residence, on 8 February (1366) to cross the Alps; he wanted to settle his affairs in Piedmont, seek financial aid from Galeazzo II Visconti and galleys from Genoa and Venice for his expedition, and try at the pope's behest and in his own interests to make peace between Galeazzo's obstreperous brother Bernabò and the shaky government of Genoa. Amadeo arrived at Susa on 13 February by way of the Mont Cenis Pass; on the fifteenth he was at Rivoli, then the seat of the Savoyard governor of Piedmont. On the twenty-sixth he was at Milan, where he remained some days with Bernabò, who entertained him, but had little interest in his proposals for peace. While still at Milan, Amadeo learned that his fourteen-year-old nephew Gian Galeazzo Visconti, "il conte di Virtù," the son of Galeazzo II, had become the father of a boy, and he hastened to Pavia on or before 9 March to offer his congratulations and to seek money and arms for the coming expedition. The baby had been born on 4 March; his mother was Isabelle of Valois, not yet eighteen, the sister of Charles V of France. At Pavia Amadeo was very much at home, for his own sister Blanche of Savoy was Galeazzo II's wife, now a grandmother at thirty.³¹

³⁰ The text of the relevant passage in Caroldo's chronicle is given by Steinherz, *Mitt. d. Inst. f. österreich. Geschichtsforschung*, IX (1888), 568, note, from the Vienna MS. 6153, fol. 264, and cited by Norden, *Papsttum u. Byzanz*, pp. 699–700, note, from the Paris MS. Ital. 320, fol. 266^v. Cf. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, pp. 133–34.

³¹ D. Muratore, "La Nascita e il battesimo del primogenito di Gian Galeazzo Visconti," *Arch. stor. lombardo*, IV (1905), 261–69. Isabelle was born in October, 1348, Gian Galeazzo in October, 1351. They had three sons, all of whom died in boyhood—Gian Galeazzo (1366–1376?), Azzone (1368–1381), and Carlo (b. 1372), who predeceased his elder brother (*ibid.*, IV, 283–84). A fourth child, Valentina (b. 1370), eventually married Louis I of Orléans-Valois, and ultimately bequeathed her claim to the Visconti duchy of Milan to her grandson Louis XII of France and to the latter's successor Francis I, both of whom will command our attention later on in this work.

Amadeo had apparently already asked the Venetian government for permission to lease five galleys and two *fuste*, "and he offered," says Caroldo, "once his expedition to assist the emperor [John V] had been launched, to place all his forces at the service of the Venetian Signoria." Although neither the *Deliberazioni* of the Senate nor the *Lettere segrete* of the Collegio confirm this statement, Caroldo knew the documents in the archives of his time. Since, however, Venetian envoys both in Cairo and in Avignon were trying to effect the resumption of trade with Alexandria, the Republic was taking no chances, and politely declined Amadeo's request. Pope Urban remonstrated with Venice in a forceful letter of 31 March (1366),³² by which time the government had already relented, especially under pressure from the Visconti. But on 6 April Amadeo was obliged to promise in writing that during his expedition to the Holy Land he would not molest anyone in Syrian waters or allow his men to do so without the consent of the Republic, and on this condition the Venetians allowed him to lease two galleys,³³ one of which was to be commanded by the Venetian Saracin Dandolo and the other, according to Romanin, by the celebrated Lucchino dal Verme.³⁴ Although his name occurs

³² Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 248, fols. 67^r–68^r: "Dilectis filiis nobili viro Marco Cornario duci ac consilio et comuni Venetiarum salutem, etc.: . . . sane dilectus filius Amedeus comes Sabaudie nobis significare curavit quod ipse et nonnulli nobiles et potentes eius socii volentes ad defensionem sacre fidei et impugnationem ultramarinorum infidelium transfretare ad terram vestram consueta Christianorum fiducia recurrentes a vobis petita pro transfretando navigia, licet habeatis eadem et ipsi pro hiis iuste satisfacere sint parati, ex eo non vultis eis concedere quia illum hostem dei et fidei prelibate . . . , soldanum videlicet Babilonie ob quedam commercia que in terris quas idem soldanus detinet quasque per ipsos nobiles putatis invadi pro tempore, sicut iam in similibus contigit, quidam concives vestri exercere proponunt non intenditis provocare . . . ," which fact, if true, Urban assails as an offense to divine majesty and as a derogation of the faith: the infamy of the alleged Venetian attitude would spread throughout the world, and he urges the Venetian government not to allow such a blot to stain "the clarity of their good name," but to follow in the footsteps of their forebears, who carried crusaders overseas and brought them back home again, and thus to make the necessary transport available to Amadeo and his followers. Cf. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 332–33, who also quotes the line from Caroldo.

³³ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VII, no. 258, p. 46. After Amadeo's return from the East, the written promise was returned to him as a gesture of courtesy by order of the doge on 13 August, 1367.

³⁴ Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 139^v, doc. dated 6 June, 1366; Samuele Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, III

elsewhere in connection with Amadeo, Lucchino did not go on the Savoyard expedition.³⁵

Considering the Mamluk domination of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, it would be hard to lead an expedition to the Holy Land without molesting anyone on the Syrian coast, but well before 27 May, 1366, Amadeo knew that he was *not* going to the Holy Land. He was going to Constantinople to assist his cousin, the Emperor John V, as is made fully clear by the contract of that date, whereby Florimont de Lesparre bound himself to serve on the expedition "oultre la mer" with thirty men-at-arms for a year.³⁶

In any event Amadeo had to look elsewhere than Venice for more galleys. His disappointment was tempered by Galeazzo II's "gracious grant" (*gratiose concessit*) of 9,600 florins on 6 April (1366) and of a like amount on the eighth, making a total of 19,200 florins, "for one half of four galleys," to which on the fourteenth Galeazzo added another 10,000 florins as an outright gift.³⁷ Before leaving Chambéry, Amadeo had collected 10,000 florins from two bankers of Lyon by farming out to them for two years the right to collect the ecclesiastical tithes which the pope had granted him "in subsidium viaggi sui ultra mare." At that rate the sexennial tithes would yield him 30,000 florins, and the bankers were not likely to lose anything on their investment.³⁸

In late April Amadeo returned briefly to his own domains apparently to muster further support for the crusade as well as to deal with other problems. He saw his wife Bonne at S. Jean de Maurienne from 5 to 8 May, after which he went to Rivoli, where he remained until the nineteenth, deeply involved in the troubled

affairs of southern Piedmont, where Joanna of Naples still had rather extensive, almost unprotected lands, which were exciting the cupidity of the Visconti. Leaving Rivoli with a large retinue on the nineteenth, Amadeo arrived back in Pavia in good time for the baptism on the feast of Pentecost (24 May) of the young Gian Galeazzo's first-born son, who now received his father's name. At the end of the three days' celebration (on the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth) Amadeo made some final preparations for his journey overseas, enrolling in his service Hugh and Louis of Chalon, Florimont de Lesparre, Jean de Montfaucon, and others. Galeazzo, apparently in an exuberant mood, now produced a further loan of 20,000 florins, and provided Amadeo with twenty-five men-at-arms, largely German, together with their squires and servitors, as well as a troop of Italian *briganti* (light infantry) under the command of sixteen "constables." Amadeo's sister Blanche gave him an additional 4,000 florins.³⁹

A final accounting was to show that Galeazzo's gifts and loans to Amadeo totaled 85,000 florins,⁴⁰ an indication of his generosity as well as of his wealth. We have already noted that

(Venice, 1855), 232. Saracin appears as "Seracenus Dandelos" in Antoine Barbier's financial accounts of the expedition, and is described as "capitaneus galee domini [Amadei]" (Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, nos. 175, 850, pp. 53, 191-92). He is a well-known figure in (later) Venetian affairs.

³⁵ The fifteenth-century chronicler Jean Servion, following his predecessor Cabaret, states in his *Chroniques de Savoye*, in *MHP*, III, *Scriptores*, I, col. 301d, that Galeazzo II Visconti gave Amadeo "pour le servir en son voyage messire Lucquin de Vermes capitayne de cent hommes darmes deslité," which Muratore, *Arch. stor. lombardo*, IV (1905), 278, note 3, shows is an error or alteration which Servion has introduced into the text of Cabaret.

³⁶ Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, doc. III, pp. 336-37, where the emperor of Constantinople is referred to twice.

³⁷ For the sources, see Muratore, *Arch. stor. lombardo*, IV, 270 and note 3.

³⁸ Cf. Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente* (1826), p. 43 and doc. v-1, p. 256, dated 4 February, 1366.

³⁹ Muratore, *Arch. stor. lombardo*, IV, 269-73, 277-78, who cites texts from the Tesoreria generale di Savoia, in the Arch. Cam. di Torino, Rotolo 65, fol. III. The funds from Blanche were forthcoming on 27 May (1366), and also "ex dono per ipsum dominum Galeaz facto domino [Amadeo] gratiose, xx m. flor. b[oni] p[onderis]," which quite understandably led Amadeo's accountant Antoine Barbier to mistake Galeazzo's loan for a gift, and correction was made by Amadeo himself after his return to Pavia from the East (in a statement of 22 September, 1367): "... et in ipso computo [Anthonii Barberii] continetur quod ipsos viginti millia florenorum recepit ipse Anthonius a carissimo fratre nostro domino Galeaz Vicecomite Mediolani dono, actamen non fuerit dono sed mutuo nobis facto per ipsum, licet idem Anthonius ipsos ex dono credidisset processisse" (Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, no. LXXXXVIII, p. 21, and cf. no. 44, p. 34).

In his edition of Antoine Barbier's accounts Bollati di Saint-Pierre has denoted Amadeo's receipts in Roman numerals and his expenditures in Arabic numerals. Concerning Galeazzo's constables and *briganti*, see, *ibid.*, nos. 63, 98, 159, 211, 434, 501, 649-50, 724, *et alibi*. Galeazzo paid the twenty-five men-at-arms (*gentes armorum*) for the first six months of their service with Amadeo (from 1 June to 1 December, 1366); thereafter Amadeo had to pay them for the remaining nine months of the expedition (until 1 September, 1367), by which time there were twenty-two left (*ibid.*, no. 879, pp. 195-96). Hereafter Bollati di Saint-Pierre's *Illustrazioni* will be cited simply as Barbier's accounts. Incidentally, names of the 16 constables, 72 *briganti*, 28 crossbowmen, and 44 men-at-arms and archers are given in the accounts (nos. 434-36).

⁴⁰ Barbier's accounts, no. LXXXXVIII, pp. 20-21.

Amadeo now received the discouraging news of the death on 25 May of Arnaud de Cervole, the robust freebooter, who was to join him with his bands of *routiers*.⁴¹ The expedition thus lost some hundreds of hardened mercenaries, to whom warfare had become a profitable way of life. Amadeo's disappointment, however, may have been tinged with some relief, for there was no discipline among them, and they would probably have plundered his vulnerable Byzantine allies with more alacrity than they would the Turks and Bulgarians whom Amadeo was going to encounter.

On Monday, 1 June (1366), Amadeo took leave of Galeazzo II and Blanche, and departed for Venice. His nephew Gian Galeazzo, "il conte di Virtù," had planned for weeks to see him off for the East, and now did so to express his gratitude to him and to do him honor. Amadeo was accompanied by a good many men-at-arms, and everyone knew that Gian Galeazzo, who never tried to conceal his physical timidity, would be escorted by a large armed retinue. At the beginning of the second week in May the apprehensive doge and Collegio had commissioned one Andrea de Olredo to go as envoy to the counts of Savoy and Virtù. Andrea was to explain that the Venetian government desired to do all honor to them both, but was also anxious to avoid the disputes and disturbances which could arise with and among the troopers who would be coming with them, who spoke a variety of languages, and who were so different from the Venetians. The counts of Savoy and Virtù were therefore requested to limit the forces coming to Venice to 500 persons of good repute.⁴² Amadeo, Gian Galeazzo, and their troopers apparently arrived in Venice on the evening of 7 June and the morning of the eighth; Amadeo remained in the city until the

eighteenth, being lodged in the palace which the Republic had reluctantly given to Francesco da Carrara, next to the church of S. Polo.⁴³

In Venice it was possible for Amadeo to concentrate upon the organization of the crusade without the manifold distractions he had encountered at Galeazzo's court in Pavia, although now the great nobles who were going overseas clustered around him with their problems. More than a hundred "nobles" and free-lance captains are known by name, who put themselves under obligation to go on the expedition, and more than a score of prominent barons, Amadeo's friends and vassals, had finally gathered in Venice, a dozen of them members of the Order of the Collar. They included Étienne de la Baume, lord of S. Denis in Bugey and of Chavannes in Franche-Comté, who as Amadeo's admiral figures prominently in Antoine Barbier's accounts; Jean de Vienne, later admiral of France (1373), who was to lose his life at Nicopolis on the last crusade of the century; Hugues (Hugh) de Chalon-sur-Saône, lord of Arlay, whose younger brother Louis was to die on the crusade; Aymar de Clermont, lord of Hauterive in Dauphiné; Gaspard de Montmayeur, the eleventh, and Richard Musard, the fifteenth knight of the Collar; and three other notables from the region between the Doubs and the Isère—Jean de S. Amour of Coligny, Jean de Grolée of Virieu, and Guillaume de Chalamont of Meximieux and Montanay. There were others, too, who presumably aspired to crusading fame, such as Guillaume de Grandson of S. Croix in Burgundy, the seventh, and Roland de Vaissy from the Bourbonnais, the ninth knight of the Collar, while from the more distant Bordelais came the valorous but hot-tempered Florimont de Lesparre, whose crusading ardor Peter I of Cyprus had kindled when in 1364 he had visited the Black Prince in Lesparre's native Gascony.⁴⁴

⁴¹ See above, Chapter 11, p. 232a.

⁴² *Lettere segrete del Collegio* (1363–1366), fol. 185^r, dated on or after 9 May, 1366: "Andrea, vadas ad magnificos dominos comitem Sabaudie et comitem Virtutum, et cuilibet eorum decenter salutato expones parte nostra quod nos considerantes adventum suum in proximo futuro Venecias et cupientes ipsos toto nostro posse honorare, sicut convenit, et remove omnia scandala et brigas que possent occurrere propter gentes que secum venient que sunt diversarum linguarum et non conformant se ad mores populi nostri" Since other unknown persons might also enter Venice under the guise of the two counts' retinue and troopers, the doge and Collegio requested "quod provideant et faciant quod non veniant Venecias cum eis ultra quingentas [V.] personas inter utrumque que sint persone bone conditionis et vite. . . ."

⁴³ Muratore, *Arch. stor. lombardo*, IV, 280, and note especially Barbier's accounts recording the payment "pro hostelagiis plurium militum, scutiferorum et officiariorum domini [Amadei], undecim dierum quibus dominus stetit apud Venecias, finitoris die XVIII mensis Junii" (no. 191, p. 55). On the palace at S. Polo, cf. Romanin, *Storia doc. di Venezia*, III, 206–7, and see Barbier, no. 916, p. 205.

⁴⁴ Cf. Servion, *Chroniques*, in *MHP*, III, *Scriptores*, I, cols. 302–3; Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, pp. 47–50, 256–59; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 145–47; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières*, pp. 333–34; Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 384–85; Cox, *Green Count of Savoy*, pp. 181, 207–8, 211. Roland de Vaissy was killed in the assault on Gallipoli (cf. Barbier's accounts, nos. 202, 255, 396), as we

Aimon [III] of Geneva also went on the crusade, the son of old Count Amadeo III and the brother of Robert of Geneva, later anti-Pope Clement VII. Aimon was well known in curial circles in Avignon, for less than three years before this he had been the center of a diplomatic storm. In 1363–1364 his powerful uncle, Cardinal Guy de Boulogne, had tried to secure for him the hand of the rich young Duchess Joanna of Durazzo, but Guy's plans had foundered on the opposition of Cardinal Talleyrand of Périgord, his rival in the Sacred College, and on that of Queen Joanna of Naples, who wanted the duchess to marry Frederick III of Sicily as part of a grand design for peace between Naples and the island kingdom of the Catalans.⁴⁵ Aimon was on the crusade when his father died (on 18 January, 1367), and so he became the twelfth count of Geneva, but he barely survived the expedition, and died himself soon after his return from the East.⁴⁶

It is difficult to determine very closely the size of Amadeo's seaborne army, which finally proved to be an impressive and costly array of multilingual forces. As Pope Urban had informed Charles V of France on 9 June, 1365, the western Emperor Charles had promised to contribute to the naval transport of a crusade "one half of all the revenues of his kingdom of Bohemia . . . for the next three years."⁴⁷ But the emperor was always more willing to promise funds than to provide them, and he appears to have given Amadeo no financial assistance at all. Besides the money advanced by Galeazzo Visconti, who shared with Amadeo the costs of four galleys, the Venetian merchant and financier Federico Corner, the friend of the king of Cyprus, loaned large sums to help meet the expenses of the expedition. Corner also provided a

galley, and accompanied the expedition to Constantinople.⁴⁸ Without recounting Amadeo's other sources of funds, we may note that the Byzantine Emperor John V later promised, and largely paid, some 15,000 florins toward the expenses of maintaining the leased galleys and meeting the wages of their crews.⁴⁹

The Savoyard fleet appears to have been larger than has hitherto been suggested. Amadeo's regulations "sur le gouvernement d'aler sur la mer," composed before his departure from Venice, contain a list of some fifteen galleys, identifying their (noble) commanders, and prescribing the order in which they were to sail.⁵⁰ When the Venetians had become certain, however, that Amadeo was not venturing into Syrian waters, they allowed him to lease additional galleys as well as transports, and at least ten Venetians are identifiable as skippers or *patroni* thereof, which probably (but not necessarily) means that the galleys and transports were of Venetian registry.⁵¹ Of these ten, eight are

⁴⁸ Barbier's accounts, nos. L, LXXXVII, 227, 802, 811, 892–94.

⁴⁹ Barbier's accounts, nos. XL, XLVII–XLIX, pp. 10, 11. The Genoese at Pera were also to loan Amadeo considerable sums (*ibid.*, nos. LI ff.).

⁵⁰ Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, doc. v, pp. 340–41, and cf. Servion, *Chron. de Savoye*, in *MHP*, III, *Scriptores*, I, cols. 302–3. That Amadeo's fleet consisted of fifteen galleys is repeated by most modern writers, on which cf. Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente* (1826), pp. 60–61; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient* (1886), I, 147–48; Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), p. 334 and note 9; Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (1938), pp. 385–86; Cox, *Green Count of Savoy* (1967), p. 211.

⁵¹ The Venetian *patroni* are as follows: Bartolommeo Bon (in Barbier's accounts, no. 180), Giovanni di Conte (nos. 129, 216, 260, 424, 594, 695–96, 867, 899, 900–1), Saracin Dandolo (nos. 175, 850), probably Donato Scagnier (no. 176), Niccolò Marini called "Casso" or "Tasso" (nos. 98, 241, 259, 425, 596, 697, 887–88), Giuliano Neri or Negri (nos. 257, 426, 595, 698, 836–37), Marino Soverani (nos. 212, 427, 597, 699, 838–39), Giovanni Davidor (nos. 159, 267), "Dardibon" [Dardi Bon] (nos. 63, 219, 258, 838–39), whose galley carried Galeazzo Visconti's constables east, and Francesco di Cola (nos. 261, 264, 428, 598, 700, 902), who commanded Federico Corner's galley (nos. LXXXVII, 227, 892–93).

Although the accounts list as *patroni galearum* both Giuliano Neri (no. 426) and Niccolò Marini, who carried Galeazzo's *briganti* east (nos. 98, 425), they seem to have been merely skippers of transports (*conductae*), on which note also no. 131 and esp. no. 300. In fact Neri carried part of Amadeo's kitchen and dining facilities (no. 257). Some of Amadeo's translators (*truchimandi*) were also Venetian (nos. 333, 359, 374, etc., 880–81).

If Amadeo armed four galleys at Venice, for which Galeazzo Visconti had paid half, he was apparently able to lease four more rather than just the two official galleys which the Venetian government had at first allowed. Saracin

shall see, and so was the lord of S. Amour (*ibid.*, no. 255). Amadeo saw to it that they were both buried with appropriate ceremony at Pera (no. 255).

⁴⁵ Kenneth M. Setton, "Archbishop Pierre d'Ameil in Naples and the Affair of Aimon III of Geneva (1363–1364)," *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 643–91, with a sketch of Aimon's career on p. 646, note. Aimon never got the spirited heiress of Durazzo, who had fallen in love with him "at first sight" [*primo aspectu*] (*ibid.*, p. 665).

⁴⁶ Dino Muratore, "Aimon III, comte de Genevois: Sa Participation à l'expédition du Comte Vert en Orient, son testament, sa mort," in the *Revue savoisienne*, XLVII (Annecy, 1906), 137–45, 208–17. Incidentally, in 1363 Aimon's sister Blanche had married Hugh of Chalon, one of the more prominent members of the expedition.

⁴⁷ Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 2 (1906), no. 1822, pp. 315–16; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1365, nos. 1–2, vol. VII (1752), p. 110.

consistently described as *patroni galearum*. Since the expedition was being undertaken, moreover, for the defense of Constantinople and for the union of the Churches,⁵² it would obviously contribute to the safety of the Genoese colony at Pera, and Amadeo's fleet contained eleven Genoese *patroni galearum*.⁵³ There were three galleys from Marseille, whose skippers are frequently referred to as receiving payments for service and for their crews.⁵⁴

All told, then, and disregarding the lesser officers in charge of transports and other vessels (*conductae, naves, ligna, panfili*), eight Venetians, eleven Genoese, and three Marseillais would appear each to have been in charge of a galley on the Savoyard expedition. This would mean a total of twenty-two galleys. Allowing for the replacement of two *patroni*, it seems not unreasonable to settle for twenty galleys. Most Venetian galleys were built in the Arsenal and owned by the state. There was only one *patronus* on a galley. He was master and manager of the vessel, but at sea he was subject to a "captain" (*capitaneus*), who had charge of the crew, and was responsible for discipline. The *patronus*, who is usually called the skipper in this work, saw to the selection and loading of cargo (under stringent rules established by the government),

and kept the financial records, which were written up by a ship's scribe.⁵⁵

If Amadeo had twenty galleys, and if his nobles and skippers accepted the advice given by the Venetians to prospective crusaders during the preceding generation—that each galley should carry 200 men, including knights, squires, rowers, and others⁵⁶—the total obviously would amount to 4,000 men, not counting the rowers and other crewmen aboard the supply ships and transports. Guillaume de Machaut puts 25 knights in a galley,⁵⁷ but Amadeo seems to have had about a thousand "knights" or men-at-arms,⁵⁸ and he would have

⁵² The duties of the *patronus* were defined by the Venetian Senate at the beginning of the century (and recorded in the *Misti*, Reg. 1, fol. 163^v, doc. dated 18 August, 1302: "[Capta] quod unicuique istarum galearum que armantur per Commune constituatur unus patronus qui debeat elligi inter XL [the Quarantia] per scrutinium . . ."). See in general the collected papers of Frederic C. Lane, *Venice and History*, Baltimore, 1966, *passim*.

⁵³ Cf. above, Chapter 9, pp. 179a, 184a. In Pera the Venetian skipper Giovanni di Conte bought a new galley, in which Amadeo finally returned to Venice after the conclusion of his "crusade," and for the wages of the 224 mariners aboard this galley from 5 May to 31 July, 1367, Amadeo paid 2,000 gold ducats (Barbier's accounts, no. 696, pp. 164–65). When Conte bought the new galley, he apparently put Nicoletto Bon in charge of his former galley, and for the wages of the 63 mariners aboard, Amadeo paid 447½ gold ducats for the period from 12 May to 21 July, 1367 (*ibid.*, no. 695, p. 164).

For roughly the same period Niccolò Marini was paid for a crew of 51 mariners (no. 697), Giuliano Neri for a crew of 71 (no. 698), Marino Soverani for a crew of 107 (no. 699), and Francesco di Cola for a crew of 101 (no. 700). Barbier has recorded payments too numerous to mention (cf. nos. 257 ff.). Since members of the various crews signed on at different times, they were paid at different intervals, and so it is hard to tell from the payments the precise number of mariners aboard each galley and transport.

⁵⁷ *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. Louis de Mas Latrie, Geneva, 1877, vv. 4602–4, p. 139, a text to which undue significance is attached by Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 147–48, and by Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 385, note 9.

⁵⁸ An enrollment list apparently dated 5 February, 1366, provides us with the names of 14 nobles who were to be accompanied by 73 "knights" or men-at-arms (*equites*) as well as with the names of some 77 nobles and free-lance captains, each of whom was to recruit and command 10 men-at-arms, together with the names of 2 other knights who are listed separately (as given in Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, doc. v, 2–3, pp. 256–59). This would have produced a total of some 936 nobles and men-at-arms.

There is no way of knowing, however, how many squires, varlets, and other attendants were to go with each man-at-arms, but in the first list of 14 nobles appear the names of the brothers Hugh and Louis of Chalon, who on the following 27 May agreed to serve Amadeo for a year with 40 knights and squires: ". . . nous servirons loielmant . . . a compaignie de quarante gentil hommes que chivalers que

Dandolo commanded the two latter galleys, conceded and possibly paid for by the state, with which the Senate was concerned on 20 and 24 July and 25 August, 1366 (*Misti*, Reg. 32, fols. 1^r, 2^r, 8^r): Dandolo was to keep in touch with other Venetian galleys in Romania, "quia utile et necessarium est propter maxima dubia et pericula que habentur et scribit Ser Saracenus Dandulo de galeis ianuensibus et provincialibus et aliis que iverunt ad soldum comitis Sabaudie. . . ."

⁵² Cf. Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I (1914), 358–59, 364, 387, 388.

⁵³ Barbier's accounts identify and furnish us with data concerning the following Genoese in charge of galleys: Giovanni di Magnari, captain of the Genoese galleys (nos. LIX, 190, 354, 720), Martino di Campofregoso (no. 365), Simondo Carmayn or Carmeyn (nos. 552, 703), Paolo Iusticier (nos. 281, 295), Ettore Vincenti (nos. 229–30, 243, 271–72, 280, 295, 311, 346), Marco di Canava (nos. 230, 284, 295, 354), Paolo di Banca (nos. 230, 243), Lanfranco Pansa (nos. 230, 243, 282, 343, 354), Ottobono di Groppo or Greppo (nos. 243, 283, 295, 344, 351), Isnardo di Gaico (nos. 286, 314, 354), and Domenico Veyrol (nos. 353–56, 423, 468, *et alibi*). Donzani Donzani, who appears as a *patronus galee* (no. 311), may have been a replacement.

⁵⁴ Barbier's accounts, nos. XIX–XXII, 157, 214, 298, 312, 384–85, 396–99, 599–602, 701–2. The three skippers from Marseille were Jean Casse, Martin Geyme, and Raymond Bonzan, the last of whom died on the expedition (*ibid.*, no. 701).

had to carry about fifty of them in a galley. Men-at-arms, however, much preferred horse-transporters when they were available, and we know that the sire de Basset did travel east in a transport.⁵⁰ Horse-transporters had a ramp at the stern which could be let down upon landing, and mounted men could ride off fully armed and ready for action. Horses fared badly on galleys, and it was very hard to unload them in an emergency; horsemen liked to keep an eye on their saddles as well as their animals, and they were more at ease in the ampler space usually available on transports. Crowding was at best the lot of those who traveled by sea, and Amadeo's expedition made its way eastward by easy stages with long stops.

Amadeo spent eleven days in Venice (8–18 June, 1366) sightseeing and shopping. The first expenditure in Antoine Barbier's accounts was

escuyers par un ant tout antier . . ." (Datta, doc. VIII, pp. 263–65).

Of these 936 nobles and men-at-arms there is no evidence that most of the latter were anyone's "vassals," as Cox, *Green Count of Savoy*, p. 208, note 12, seems to think. Florimont de Lesparre also agreed to serve "a compaignie de trente gentiz hommes outre la mer per un ant tout entier," and of course Lesparre's knights would be accompanied by squires (Bollati di Saint-Pierre, *Illustrazioni*, doc. III, pp. 336–37). But when the day of fulfillment arrived, military contracts were subject to the vagaries of circumstance, and (where they can be checked) the final figures are rarely in close accord with those of the contracts.

⁵⁰ Barbier's accounts, nos. 75, 93, 110–11, 131, 215: ". . . conducta in qua vadit dominus de Basset. . . ." Horse-transporters, as we have seen, were called *huissieria*, *usserii*, *usseriae*, etc., *huissiers*, *huissiers* in French, but I do not recall Barbier's use of this word. Aimon III of Geneva traveled at least part of the way east in a transport (*ibid.*, no. 226). Although Amadeo and most of the nobles went eastward and returned in the galleys, many of the men-at-arms undoubtedly traveled in the transports. In this connection note Philippe de Mézières's advice, written in 1388–1389, to the young King Charles VI of France, upon whom he urged leadership of a great crusade:

"In fact, I recommend you to have as few galleys as possible on account of their cost. Nowadays an armed galley costs fourteen or fifteen hundred florins per month, though the Old Pilgrim has seen the day when such a galley cost only 500 florins [but in fact the Old Pilgrim never did see such a day]. Moreover, a galley can usually carry only twenty-five men-at-arms and thirty or forty crossbowmen. A medium-sized ship [*nef*, *navis*] takes one to two hundred soldiers and eighty or one hundred horses and any number of archers, and the total cost will not be more than three or four hundred florins.

"I don't say that armed galleys should not be employed to carry your Majesty or for the use of other great persons. They have their uses, too, in making landings for purposes of rest and recreation and exercise much easier, but in general it is best to use as few as possible. And in this business of shipping, don't trust seafaring people. They

for eighteen cubits (*brachia*) of green cloth, which Amadeo's tailor purchased at 1½ florins a cubit, to make the Green Count a mantle, hose, and hood, with an extra charge for cutting the material to a pattern provided by the tailor.⁶⁰ Later on five cubits of green cloth were purchased to clothe a page, and other vestments were acquired for Amadeo himself. There were frequent rentals of gondolas to get about the city (*bargae . . . pro eundo per civitatem*), and everywhere Amadeo and his suite went they found things they needed or wanted.

Sometimes Amadeo did the buying, but mostly aides did it for him. They bought tons of provisions, and Amadeo's physician Guy Albin loaded up on medicines and unguents at the apothecary shop of Pietro de Colona, all for his lordship's galley. Aides bought paper and ink and a large leather portfolio (*maleta*) for Amadeo's correspondence, mattresses, bed linen, pillows, cushions, tables, and glassware, including two glass water-clocks and a leather box in which to send them off to Countess Bonne at Chambéry. They paid a florin for turnspits (*pro quibusdam rutissieurs*) for the kitchen on Amadeo's galley, and took on board an abundance of "Malmsey" wine, which was always plentiful in Venice. Amadeo took the opportunity to have various items repaired by Venetian craftsmen, including two silver candelabra and a pair of coffers (*bugiae*), in which he sometimes kept money, and he purchased another money chest, an *archa*, which may have caught his fancy. The armorer Aimoneto made a silk standard twelve feet long for his galley. He also made a great banner and twelve other large and sixty small banners, four pennons, and silk fringe enough to bind the standard and all the banners, and provided the lance-poles necessary to fly them in the breeze as Amadeo's galley sailed into and out of ports along the way. Another armorer Piero Tuare was paid for making another twenty great banners (*viginti banderiae magnae*), presumably one for each of his twenty galleys, and seventy small banners.⁶¹ Amadeo made the usual rounds of the churches. On 11 June he went to S. Marco, where he gave a florin to the poor and another to the custodian of the campanile, who unlocked the door to allow him and his

make immense profits out of the hire of galleys" (*Le Songe du vieil pèlerin*, ed. G. W. Coopland, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1969, II, 101, 436).

⁶⁰ Barbier's accounts, no. 1, p. 27.

⁶¹ For the banners, see Barbier's accounts, nos. 47–48, pp. 34–35, and nos. 269–70, pp. 75–79.

companions to climb to the bell-tower to enjoy the view from its height.⁶² On the same day he went to S. Lucia, where he left another florin behind, and to S. Antonio, which meant still another florin. On the thirteenth he went to S. Giorgio Maggiore, where he kissed the relics, and presented three florins to the Benedictines.⁶³

On 19 June (1366) Amadeo's aides hired a launch for 14 solidi Venetian, and moved his money chests from the city to S. Niccolò di Lido.⁶⁴ Amadeo had apparently preceded his portable treasury to the Lido, having gone aboard his galley to resounding cries of *Viva Savoia!* Thereafter the financial accounts of the expedition record his progress to Gallipoli. On 23 June he was at Pola in southern Istria, where he added to the armament on Giovanni di Conte's galley, and from the Istrian peninsula he sent messengers to Bohemia, Hungary, and Constantinople. Then he began to sail down the eastern coast of the Adriatic, and after an apparent stop at Zara, he arrived on 1 July at Ragusa, where he was well received, and where he rented a small vessel to take a letter to the doge of Venice. He seems to have put into port at Durazzo, and reached Corfu on 6 July. By the seventeenth he had reached the Venetian station at Modon, and on the nineteenth he was behind the high walls of Coron. While at Coron he made amends of two florins for damage which his soldiers did in the vineyard of one Ioannines Amoyrons, and paid a local clerk named Michele Fosco 15 florins for the more extensive damage done to his vineyards. He also made a gift to the Franciscans, and paid for damage done to their convent, where he stayed during his sojourn in Coron, to the tune of 25 florins, and gave 5 florins' alms to the local hospital.⁶⁵

In the region of Modon and Coron, how-

ever, Amadeo encountered a serious matter, and he took the time to settle (for a little while at least) the dispute between his wife's aunt Marie of Bourbon, who still maintained her pretensions to the principality of Achaea, and Angelo Acciajuoli, archbishop of Patras (1365–1367), who supported the Angevin-Tarentine claims to Achaea. Marie of Bourbon had been married, as we have seen, to the titular Latin Emperor Robert, who had died in September, 1364. Robert had of course also been prince of Achaea, and Marie was now trying to vindicate on behalf of her son (by a previous marriage) Hugh of Lusignan, titular prince of Galilee, her alleged rights to the principality against the legitimist claims of Robert's younger brother Philip [II] of Anjou-Taranto, who styled himself prince of Achaea as well as Latin emperor. The forces of Archbishop Angelo had both Marie and her son Hugh under siege in Port-de-Jonc (Old Navarino) when Amadeo arrived on the scene, and he negotiated the end of the siege but not the end of the contest, for Hugh still hoped to find in the Morea the future he had lost in Cyprus.⁶⁶

At Coron Amadeo's flotilla was joined by the galleys which had come from Genoa and Marseille,⁶⁷ and the enlarged fleet sailed from the Gulf of Coron, around Cape Matapan and past the island of Cerigo (the ancient Cythera), heading for the Euboeote port of Negroponte. On 28 July Amadeo stopped for some reason

⁶² *Ibid.*, no. 19, p. 29: "... dominus [Amadeus] dedit dicta die [XI Junii] custodienti clavem campanilis Sancti Marci unum florenum."

⁶³ Barbier's accounts, nos. 1–61, pp. 27–37, cover Amadeo's expenditures from 10 to 20 June. The earliest dated entry is the tenth (no. 16), but others presumably go back to the eighth.

⁶⁴ Barbier's accounts, no. 56, p. 36: "... pro locagio unius bargete, super qua portata fuit financia domini [Amadei] de Veneciis apud Sanctum Nycolaum. . . ."

⁶⁵ Barbier's accounts, nos. 62 (Pola), 73 (dispatch of messengers to Bohemia, Hungary, and Constantinople), 75–81 (*Aragussa*, Ragusa), 82 (payment of small loans contracted to make gifts at *Jarra*, Zara?, *et cuidam buffoni ducis de Durat*, Durazzo), 83 (*Turfont* should doubtless be *Curfout*, Corfu, as transcribed by Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, doc. xiv. 4, p. 186), 105 (Modon), 106 (Coron), 108, 112, 114.

⁶⁶ Alfred Morel-Fatio, ed., *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, Geneva, 1885, pars. 690–700, pp. 152–54; Servion, *Chroniques de Savoye*, in *MHP*, III, *Scriptores*, I, 303–4, whence the confusion in Datta, *Spedizione in Oriente*, pp. 89–92; but see Wm. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 287–89; Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 329–31; Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque*, Paris, 1969, I, 247–50. Marie was the daughter of Louis I, first duke of Bourbon (d. 1342); Amadeo's wife Bonne was the daughter of Marie's eldest brother, Pierre I of Bourbon (d. 1356). On 21 July (1366) Amadeo gave 100 florins to Guillaume de Tanlay, "captain of the castle of Jonc" (Barbier's accounts, no. 115, p. 44). Tanlay was Marie's castellan at Port-de-Jonc, and he had held the castle for her. Later, on 14 August, Amadeo distributed six florins among the mariners on his galley, "because they had landed men-at-arms on the shore before the castle of Jonc" (*ibid.*, no. 150, p. 49). On Hugh of Lusignan and Peter I of Cyprus, see above, pp. 243a, 244.

⁶⁷ Cf. Servion, *Chron.*, in *MHP*, III, *Scriptores*, I, 303: "... ou ilz trovarent l'armee qui venoit de Genes, et l'armee de Marseillie et l'armee d'Ayguesmortes," which may mean that one of the three Marseillais galleys was from Aigues-Mortes.

at the island of S. Giorgio d' Arborea,⁶⁸ the ancient Belbina at the entrance to the Saronic Gulf, but proximity to Athens did not draw him into the Catalan port of Piraeus. Besides, as we shall see in a later chapter, the Catalans and Venetians had been getting along very badly of late. But he did put in at Cape Colonna (*in portu Colompnarum*), the ancient Sunium, and had reached the well-walled port of Negroponte before 2 August.⁶⁹ Amadeo spent about two weeks at Negroponte, where he changed money at the rate of 70 solidi to the ducat,⁷⁰ and his physician Guy Albin spent 57 pounds, 4 solidi Venetian for rose sugar, rose water, oil of roses and oil of violets, lemon and rose-and-violet syrups, soft soap, lozenges and medicines, collyrium for the eyes, and terebinth for some purpose or other.⁷¹ While the fleet was at Negroponte, Amadeo gave two florins to some men from Thebes, the capital of the Catalan duchy of Athens, who brought him foodstuffs, presumably as a gift from the Theban municipality.⁷² Apparently all his galleys had not yet arrived, because on 8 August he gave 10 solidi to a varlet who had gone overland to meet two galleys which he was expecting, and later (on 18 September, by which time he was in Constantinople) he reimbursed the unnamed skipper of a Genoese galley to the extent of 20 florins for expenses which the latter said he had incurred in waiting four days at Nauplia for Amadeo's "other galleys," presumably the two the varlet had gone to meet.⁷³

On 15 August Amadeo ordered that an accountable advance of 100 florins be given to Gaspard de Montmayeur, whom he sent ahead on a scouting mission to Turkish-held Gallipoli.⁷⁴ Shortly thereafter the fleet raised anchor, and rowers propelled the galleys slowly from the haven of Negroponte, with banners, standards, and pennons flying from the mastheads and yard-arms, "tellement que cesteoit belle et riche chose a veoir." They skirted the island of Euboea (probably to the south to sail by Chios, which had been in the hands of the Genoese for

twenty years), and made for the island of Lesbos, where Francesco Gattilusio, "lord of Mytilene" (*dominus de Matelin*), awaited the crusade. Amadeo gave Francesco's minstrels a florin, and on 21 August he paid a tenant of the lord of Mytilene three florins for taking a letter to Montmayeur at Gallipoli, doubtless telling him of his arrival at Lesbos and informing him of the fleet's departure for Gallipoli.⁷⁵

Amadeo sailed up the Dardanelles on the same day (21 August), and according to the Savoyard chroniclers, Paulus, the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, now came out in a galley to meet him.⁷⁶ Amadeo was delighted to see him, for Paulus was well informed on conditions in Constantinople, and had had a long experience in the Levant. Amadeo asked him for news of the emperor, "le quel ly dist quil estoit encores emprison": the emperor was still "imprisoned." He asked for news of Louis the Great of Hungary, "et ly dist quil nen savoit nulles nouvelles": there was no news of Louis. "In God's name," said the count, "the king of Hungary offered to come by land in full force, and on his word I have come, but come or not, we shall not fail to seek encounter with the infidels and enemies of Christendom and of the emperor."⁷⁷

Disappointed but undaunted, Amadeo landed his forces on the north shore of the Dardanelles, and promptly began an attack upon the Turkish garrison at Gallipoli. The Turks had occupied the town a dozen years before (in 1354),⁷⁸ their first beachhead on the European continent, but their garrison seems to have been inadequate for its defense against a host as large as they were now called upon to meet. Their resistance was fierce. The Savoyards drove them back, however, "et prindrent corage pour ce bon commencement." Thereupon Amadeo "laid siege to

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 154–55.

⁶⁹ Barbier's accounts, no. 121: ". . . dicta die [28 July] in portu Sancti Georgii de Arbore. . . ."

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 123.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, nos. 151, 220.

⁷² *Ibid.*, no. 221.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, no. 234: ". . . dedit dominus [Amadeus] quibusdam hominibus d'Estives, qui sibi apportaverunt quedam victualia ex parte comunitatis dicte ville, duos florenos. . . ."

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 133, 231.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 127.

⁷⁶ Paulus had succeeded Pierre Thomas in the Latin patriarchate on 17 April, 1366 (Conrad Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I [1913, repr. 1960], 206). He had previously been archbishop of Smyrna and of Thebes; on his career, see Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), pp. 45–47. Paulus collaborated closely with Amadeo throughout the crusade, on which note Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (1930), pp. 141–43, 146, and Barbier's accounts, nos. LXXXI, 388, 392, esp. 500, 1063–64. The patriarch in question was obviously not the Byzantine patriarch, Philotheus Coccinus (1364–1376).

⁷⁷ Servion, *Chron.*, col. 305.

⁷⁸ There has been some controversy, which need not detain us, as to whether the Turks occupied Gallipoli in 1354 or 1355, on which note George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, Oxford, 1956, p. 473.

Gallipoli both by land and by sea, so that no one could go in or out," and "the count ordered three assaults in order the better to hem in the city," two by land and the third by sea. All was soon ready, and as the clarions and trumpets sounded, the cry went up *à l'assaut, à l'assaut!* Roland de Vaissy was the first to mount the walls, but he was struck by a large stone hurled by a Turk, fell from his high perch, and was killed, the first knightly casualty of the expedition. Night fell, and the attacks ceased, to be resumed in the morning, and Gallipoli was again "bien assally, bien deffandu." We are assured that the Christian knights performed wondrous feats of arms, "for they took no account of their lives, and it seemed to them that in dying they went straight to paradise." Francesco Gattilusio, the lord of Mytilene, had joined Amadeo in the attack, and assailed the Turks from the sea.

The Turks outnumbered the Savoyards more than two to one, we are told, but Amadeo fought like a lion, and so did the lords of Geneva, Chalon, Lesparre, Basset, Clermont, and Grandson. Again the long, hard contest lasted until sundown, and one still did not know who had got the better of it. Although Amadeo believed that, had the night not come, he would have defeated the Turks and taken Gallipoli, he accepted Gattilusio's advice to retreat to the safety of the galleys until the assault could be resumed the next day. That night the Turks gathered their belongings, "and abandoned the town," so that in the morning the native Greeks cried out to the crusaders on the galleys, "Signeurs cristiens venes, car les turcs ont la ville vuydel!" Gattilusio heard them, and informed Amadeo. When investigation revealed that, indeed, the Turks had fled, "the count descended to the shore and all his company, and entered the town, and there they remained some days."⁷⁹

The crusaders took Gallipoli on Sunday, 23 August (1366), on which day Amadeo appointed a certain Aimon "called Michally" as captain of both the castle and the town at a monthly wage of 120 florins. On 16 September, however, the administration of civil affairs was put in the hands of James of Lucerne, who was to receive twenty florins a month. These appointments lasted until mid-June of the following year

when Amadeo restored Gallipoli to his imperial cousin John V. The historical data are derived from Antoine Barbier's accounts:

He paid at Gallipoli, by order of the lord [Amadeo], the garrison of the said place for the wages which milord owed the men of the garrison, settlement of the account having been made with them on 14 June [1367], on which day he turned over the castle and city of Gallipoli to the forces of the lord emperor of Constantinople. First, he paid the said Michally, captain of the castle of Gallipoli, in quittance of 1,168 florins, which milord owed him for his wages for nine months and 22 days, beginning on 23 August, 1366, and ending on 13 [it should be 14] June, 1367, during which time he served milord by guarding the said castle at a stipend of 120 florins a month. . . .⁸⁰

He paid James of Lucerne, captain of the town of Gallipoli, in quittance of the 178½ florins which milord owed him for his wages for eight months and 28 days, beginning on 16 September, 1366, and ending on 14 June, 1367, during which he served milord at a stipend of 20 florins a month. . . .⁸¹

In the meantime, on 26 August (1366), Amadeo's accountant was instructed to give a florin "to a certain man who had brought milord the news of the exit which the Turks made from the castle and town of Gallipoli."⁸² On the same day payments began for guard duty, as the garrison was being formed, and on this day, too, Amadeo sent a messenger named Martin off to Savoy to tell Countess Bonne and her councillors that his forces had scored an important victory over the Turks.⁸³ Bonne, incidentally, answered her husband promptly, for two months later (on 25

⁷⁹ Barbier's accounts, no. 613, pp. 146–47, and see nos. 159, 166, 252, 842 (*libravit . . . Aymoni dicto Michaili*), 943. Neither Michally nor James of Lucerne was paid for 14 June, 1367, the reckoning being done *exclusive* of the day on which the Byzantines reoccupied Gallipoli.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 614, p. 147, and on James of Lucerne, note nos. LXXXVI–LXXXVII, 220, 228. On 26 August (1366) James paid out 15 pounds, 16 solidi Venetian of Amadeo's funds for having 16 casks (*dolia*) of wine unloaded from the ships and brought into Gallipoli (no. 160). He also paid out 6 pounds, 16 solidi for transporting provisions, used lumber, and the like from outside the town into the castle and for building a gate in the castle (no. 162).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, no. 161, and cf. no. 209, which entries shed doubt on the account in the Savoyard chronicles that Francesco Gattilusio had heard the news shouted from the shore by some of the Greeks of Gallipoli.

⁸² *Ibid.*, nos. 156, 158: ". . . in municione castri et ville de Gallipulli, viz. pro stipendiis . . . temporis quo domino [Amadeo] servire convenerunt [Ludovicus Viliardi de Avignone et Anthonius Davidis eius socius] stando in garnisione . . ." and see nos. 159, 164–65, 196, 203–4, 211, 223–25, 252, 434–36, 500, on the Savoyard garrison in Gallipoli.

⁷⁹ Servion, *Chron.*, cols. 305–9. In August, 1367, after Amadeo's return to Venice, he gave 10 gold ducats in *helemosinam* to the unfortunate James of Strassburg, "cui Turci pugnum amputaverunt et nasum ante Galipully et etiam oculos extraxerunt" (Barbier's accounts, no. 771).

October) two nobles from her court were in Venice, where the Senate granted them permission to go to Constantinople to the exalted lord count of Savoy with letters and "with three companions, arms for their own persons, and other light harness." They could go on any galley or other vessel, armed or unarmed, making the usual run to Modon, Coron, Negroponte, and Constantinople.⁸⁴

Although Iorga gives scant attention to Amadeo's expedition, which he regarded "not as a crusade, but as an escapade,"⁸⁵ the taking of Gallipoli was nevertheless (says Halecki) "the first success achieved by the Christians in their struggle for the defense of Europe, and at the same time the last great Christian victory [over the Turks] during all the fourteenth century."⁸⁶ The Turks had used Gallipoli as the gateway into Europe. In 1359 they had appeared under the walls of Constantinople. They seem to have entered Adrianople about January, 1361, occupied Demotica in November, 1361, and were firmly ensconced in Philippopolis before the end of the year 1363. Murad I seems to have established the Ottoman court at Adrianople a year or so before the Savoyard expedition.⁸⁷

The frightened Emperor John V had reason to go to Buda, as we have seen, to enlist the aid of Louis the Great, whom Amadeo was expecting to participate in the crusade. Jireček recalls the account of a knowledgeable contemporary, Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna (1343–1408), whose father was a physician at Louis's court, that the emperor offended his royal host by refusing to doff his hat in the latter's presence and by conducting himself with an arrogance unbecoming in one who sought help of another.⁸⁸ This is not the picture we get of John V

from other sources, but whatever the reason for the distrust which arose between the two rulers, when John departed from the Hungarian court, he had to leave his young son Manuel behind as a hostage.⁸⁹ It is conceivable that John saw in Louis's preparations for a crusade the prospect of further incursions into Serbian, Bulgarian, and even Byzantine territories, and John may have thought for a while that the weakened Bulgarians, from whom he had wrested Anchialus on the Black Sea (in 1364), would make better allies against the Turks than the Hungarians would.

If John entertained any such illusion when he left Buda, it was quickly dispelled when he got back to Vidin, the capital of western Bulgaria, which the Hungarians had taken in May, 1365. John Šišman, the tsar of (independent) eastern Bulgaria, doubtless suspicious of John's visit to Buda, refused to allow him to return to Constantinople through his lands, and so John could not sail down the Danube (by the route he had gone to Hungary), for the Danube lay within Šišman's easy reach. John's communications with Constantinople were apparently not cut off, but his return was, and since his eldest son Andronicus [IV] was married to a Bulgarian princess,⁹⁰ one now suspects (and possibly one did then) some measure of unpleasant collusion between the tsar and Andronicus, whose later years were to be full of rebellion against his father.

The Savoyard chroniclers helped to create the legend that the tsar Šišman had imprisoned John (*qu'il estoit encores emprison*),⁹¹ but the Latin

⁸⁴ Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 20^r.

⁸⁵ Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières* (1896), pp. 336–37: "Ce n'était pas même une croisade . . . cette expédition, qui ressembla beaucoup à une équipée."

⁸⁶ Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 146.

⁸⁷ Const. Jireček, "Zur Würdigung der neuentdeckten bulgarischen Chronik," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XIV (Berlin, 1892), 258–61, and Jireček's review of Iorga, in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XVIII (1909), 582–83; Ostrogorsky, *Byz. State*, pp. 478–79; and the rich but rather meandering account of Franz Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.–15. Jahrhundert)*, Munich, 1944, pp. 41–55, who would put the Turkish occupation of Adrianople in the spring of 1361 (pp. 46–47). See above, Chapter II, note 106.

⁸⁸ Jireček, in *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XVIII, 583, a reference to the chapter *De superbia* in Conversino's *Liber memorandum rerum*, on which cf. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, pp. 134–35. Giovanni di Conversino "da Ravenna" was born

in 1343 at Buda. Learned wanderer and public lecturer at intellectual centers in northern Italy and in Friuli, Conversino served both the Carraresi and the Republic of Ragusa as chancellor. He was formerly confused with Giovanni di Jacopo Malpaghini da Ravenna, who served as Petrarch's secretary for almost four years (1364–1368), and apparently wrote nothing except a letter on Petrarch's death.

⁸⁹ K. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, "Prooemien zu Chrysobullen von Demetrius Cydones," in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, June–December 1888, pp. 1413, 1419, cited by Halecki and by George T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387*, Rome, 1960, pp. 12–13 (*Orientalia Christiana analecta*, no. 159). See above, note 24.

⁹⁰ Cydones, *Oratio pro subsidio Latinorum*, in PG 154 (1866), col. 976AB; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzantina*, XXXVII, 51 (Bonn, III, 557). Andronicus's wife was named Maria. According to Gregoras, she was the daughter of the tsar [John] Alexander, and was thus the sister of Šišman (cf. Jireček, *Archiv f. slav. Philologie*, XIV, 262–65).

⁹¹ Cf. Servion, *Chron.*, cols. 305, 310, 311.

Patriarch Paulus had doubtless informed Amadeo of the true nature of John's plight which was, after all, imprisonment of a sort. Amadeo entered Constantinople on 2 or 3 September (1366), and from the fourth Barbier's disbursements in the Greek capital begin with the payment of wages to the interpreter Paolo da Venezia and with gifts to the skippers, pilots, and scribes of the galleys.⁹² Shortly after Amadeo's arrival in the city John's wife, the Empress Helena Cantacuzena (John VI's daughter), gave him 12,000 "parperi" or *hyperperi* to help meet the expenses of an "armada" with which he proposed to enter Bulgaria by the Black Sea to clear a way for the "lord emperor of Constantinople, who could not return because of the interference which the emperor of Bulgaria was causing him."⁹³

At this point Amadeo's expedition almost ceased to be a "crusade," and his chief objective became the rescue of John V from his predicament at Vidin. The Genoese podestà of Pera gave Amadeo some horses, and the "commune" generously made two more galleys available.⁹⁴ Helena Cantacuzena also provided two galleys which appear in Barbier's accounts as being loaned by the absent emperor himself.⁹⁵ Amadeo's tailor bought silks and furs in the Genoese shops at Pera,⁹⁶ and his aides bought furniture and utensils in the Venetian quarter along the

south shore of the Golden Horn, "in burgo Veneciarum," between the Porta Viglae and the Portae Peramatis et S. Marci.⁹⁷ The physician Guy Albin was busy again among the apothecary shops, buying 6 pounds of rose sugar, 3 pounds of a "laxative electuary," 25 pounds of figs, 12 pounds of dried prunes, and other things, including 18 *saculi pro stomacho*,⁹⁸ all of which suggests that Amadeo was having some interior difficulty.

The *patroni* of the galleys were furnished with 71 new oars, which had been made "in the arsenal of the lord emperor," and 32 *modii* of grain were purchased from Bernabò di S. Stefano of Pera for making ship's biscuit. Bernabò also provided ten sides of bacon (*mezanae baconis*).⁹⁹ An awning and eight more banners were made at Pera for Amadeo's galley.¹⁰⁰ As preparations were under way for part of the fleet to go north into the Black Sea, Amadeo dispatched the lords of Urtières and Fromentes in a galley "to the lord emperor of Constantinople at Vidin, but the galley could not get beyond the mouth of the Black Sea because of the stormy weather, although they had remained eight days in a certain port called 'Giront' [and called (Argironion by the Greeks, the present-day Umur-yeril], during which time they waited for suitable weather."¹⁰¹ Barbier paid large numbers of bills on 3 October, and on the fourth Amadeo's fleet moved northward, cleared the "devil's current," and on the sixth reached a village which Barbier calls "L' Orfenal,"¹⁰² the modern Rumelifeneri ("lighthouse of Europe"), on the ancient promontory of Panium at the entrance to

⁹² Barbier's accounts, nos. 173 ff. R. J. Loenertz, *Les Recueils de lettres de Démétrius Cydonès*, Città del Vaticano, 1947, p. 111, places Amadeo's entry into the Byzantine capital on 2 September.

⁹³ Barbier's accounts, no. III: "... in exonerationem expensarum navigiorum armate domini [Amadei] fiendarum per ipsum in Mare Maiori eundo ad partes Burgarie pro expeditione domini imperatoris Constantinopolis, qui reverti non poterat propter impedimentum quod sibi faciebat imperator Burgarie." Two *hyperperi* (in Greek ὑπέρπυρα) of the weight of Constantinople were exchanged at the rate of one gold ducat (*ibid.*, no. CXVII, p. 25). The Greek neuter *hyperpyra* is commonly rendered as (masculine) *hyperperi* in the Latin sources. John V's mother, the dowager Empress Anna "Palaeologina" of Savoy, had died at Thessalonica probably in 1365 (R. J. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, pp. 315-16).

⁹⁴ Barbier's accounts, nos. 206, 296: "... due galee quas Comune Pere domino [Amadeo] generose concessit in subsidium. . . ." The skippers of these were Domenico Veyrol (*ibid.*, nos. 353 ff.) and Martino di Campofregoso (no. 365).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 297: "... due galee quas dominus imperator Constantinopolis domino [Amadeo] mutuaverat. . . ." but elsewhere the galleys are "tradite domino per dominam imperatricem Constantinopolis" (no. 327).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. 207-8, 273.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 222, pp. 63-64, and cf. no. 263. The Venetian quarter occupied much the same area in Constantinople from the twelfth century into the later fifteenth, on which see H. F. Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople . . .," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XL (1920), 68-88; R. Janin, "Les Sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople," *Revue des études byzantines*, IV (1946), 166-71, and *Constantinople byzantine*, Paris, 1964, pp. 247-49. The Venetian quarter stood below the Süleymaniye, between the present Gazi and Karaköy-Eminönü Bridges (cf. Ernest Mamboury, *Istanbul touristique*, Galata, 1951, maps on p. 38 and opp. p. 64). Amadeo occupied a house in Constantinople apparently near the *rua Venetorum* (Barbier's accounts, no. 270, pp. 78-79).

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 247, p. 69.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 262, 265-66.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 271.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, no. 268. Argironion is on the Asiatic coast of the northern Bosphorus, just south of the present station of Anadolukavağı (see Mamboury, *Istanbul touristique*, p. 553 and map opp. p. 536).

¹⁰² Barbier's accounts, nos. 274-77.

the Black Sea. On 17–19 October, at Sozopolis on the southern approach to the Gulf of Burgas, Barbier paid 600 florins to six Genoese galley *patroni* who were going with Amadeo into “Burgaria”—Vincenti, Iusticier, Pansa, Ottobono di Groppo, Marco di Canava, and Isnardo di Gaico.¹⁰³ The Genoese were at home on the Black Sea.

Sozopolis, lacking a strong garrison, was quickly taken by force, if we can believe the Savoyard chronicles, as were the nearby coastal towns of “Manchopoly” and “Scafida.” Sozopolis was in Bulgarian hands, but in the harbor of Scafida the crusaders found several Turkish vessels, which they sank *en combatant*, giving no quarter to those aboard. According to the Savoyard account, they next seized “L’Assillo” (Axillo, Anchialus, now Pomorie), a place well known in Byzantine history. The inhabitants of the captured towns expressed astonishment that the count of Savoy should have thus invaded the lands of the tsar of Bulgaria, who had never done him any harm, to which the count replied that he did so because the tsar had taken his cousin, the emperor of Constantinople, and that he would never cease making war on the Bulgarians until the emperor was set free.¹⁰⁴

Anchialus was close to “Scafida” (or “Stafida”), from which Amadeo’s fleet soon sailed the short distance north to Mesembria *appartenant a l’empereur de Burgarie*. Here Amadeo expected and met more serious resistance. Once more he decided upon three “assaults,” two by land and the third by sea. The first division of his land forces was put under the command of Florimont de Lesparre and the sire de Basset, who chose Guillaume de Grandson and Jean de Grolée to join them. Amadeo himself took charge of the second (and apparently larger) detachment, which included Aimon III of Geneva, the lords of Chalon, Urtières, and Clermont, as well as the

nobles from Savoy, Burgundy, and Dauphiné. Francesco Gattilusio, the lord of Mytilene, and the “gallees Iannoyses” were to assail Mesembria from the harbor. The Bulgarians fought well, say the Savoyard chroniclers, but “their city was taken and put to sack, and those within to the sword, because they had killed so many Christians in the attack, and because there were many knights and squires wounded.”¹⁰⁵ The piety of the account would have been lessened by the recognition of the fact that the Bulgarians were also Christians.

Barbier’s accounts show that Amadeo had entered Mesembria by 21 October (1366) when he ordered the payment of 6 florins to an officer whom he was sending back to Anchialus. On the same day he instructed Barbier to give 2 florins “to a certain person who had penetrated the wall of the town of Mesembria when milord attacked the place. . . .” On the twenty-second he provided for the payment of 120 florins to Berlion de Foras and Guillaume de Chalamont, whom he appointed “captains of Mesembria,” for their expenses and those of the company which he was leaving as a garrison in the fortress by the harbor.¹⁰⁶ He was apparently in a jovial mood on the twenty-third when he gave 10 florins’ *pourboire* to the sailors on board the galleys of Vincenti, Iusticier, Ottobono di Groppo, and Marco di Canava, as well as to those on board the two Genoese galleys from Pera and the two imperial galleys from Constantinople. The same amount went to the seamen from Marseille who were sailing with Jean Casse and Martin Geyme, both *patroni* of galleys, to those on the galley of Giovanni di Magnari of Genoa, and “to the mariners of the three great galleys and two transports [*conducte*] from Venice, namely ten florins to each galley and six florins to each transport. . . .” The Venetian galleys were those of Giovanni di Conte, Francesco di Cola, and Dardibon; the transports were those of Niccolò Marini “Casso” and Giuliano Neri.¹⁰⁷ Since the crew of Raymond Bonzan’s galley from Marseille continued in Amadeo’s service and (as we shall note) received their 10 florins later, the Savoyard fleet on the western shores of the Black Sea consisted of at least seven galleys from

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, nos. 280–86.

¹⁰⁴ Servion, *Chron.*, col. 310: “[Le conte de Savoye et ses gens] alerent devant Suzopoly, ou ilz entrèrent a force. . . . Les prisonniers pris es villes de Manchopoly, Suzopoly, et Scafida et Lacillo furent dire au conte quilz estoient merveilliez pourquoy il preignoit et gastoit le terrain de l’empereur de Burgarie leurs seigneurs, qui onques riens ne luy avoit meffait; aulx queulx il respondist, que ce faisoit il pour ce que l’empereur de Burgarie avoit pris son cousin germain l’empereur de Constantinoble, et quil ne cesseroit mais de guerroyer les Burgariens, iusques a tant que l’empereur Alexe [Jean] fust delivre a sa liberte. . . .” On the garrison left at Anchialus, note Barbier’s accounts, nos. 287, 362, and esp. no. 405, which informs us that Amadeo made Pierre Vibod “captain of the said place.”

¹⁰⁵ Servion, *Chron.*, col. 311.

¹⁰⁶ Barbier’s accounts, nos. vii, 287–89, 727. On Berlion de Foras and Guillaume de Chalamont, both Knights of the Collar, note Cox, *Green Count of Savoy* (1967), pp. 181, 182–83, 361, and on provision for the garrison at Mesembria, see Barbier, nos. 290–91, 443.

¹⁰⁷ Barbier’s accounts, nos. 295–300.

Genoa and Pera, two from Constantinople, three from Marseille, and three from Venice, fifteen in all, not counting at least two transports from Venice and certain other vessels which are mentioned in Barbier's accounts.¹⁰⁸

Amadeo remained at Mesembria for "some days" to see that the wounded were cared for, and during this period he is said to have turned over his new conquests "aux gens de lempereur de Grece." Although the distances which his expedition was now traveling were short, his rapidity of movement gives the impression of highly competent organization, for the Savoyard host had reached Varna by 25 October, having already taken the castle of "Lemona" along the way. Leaving the usual garrison at Lemona (on Cape Emine), Amadeo had pushed on immediately to Varna, the chief Bulgarian stronghold on the Euxine coast. As the fleet was casting anchor "before Varna," Amadeo sent back two transports (*ligna*) for some reason to the garrison at Lemona, and gave their *patroni* 10 florins for the expenses they would incur in going there.¹⁰⁹ At Varna, on 1 November, Raymond Bonzan's crew on the third galley from Marseille received 10 florins' *pourboire*,¹¹⁰ which suggests that they had not been present at the assault on Mesembria, where Amadeo had given a like sum to the seamen on the other galleys.

Varna was well walled and well garrisoned, apparently too strong to take by storm, and so on the advice of his old comrades-in-arms Amadeo decided to reduce the place by siege. It was a grim prospect, for winter was coming, and so he sent Jean de Vienne and Guillaume de Grandson into the city on an exploratory mission to discuss terms of surrender. They found that the Bulgarians had no intention of giving up Varna, but they were willing not to harass the Savoyard forces, and agreed to supply them with provisions. They also proposed sending "twelve

of their citizens to their lord, the emperor of Bulgaria, to obtain the emperor of Constantinople's release from prison, and the count promised to do them no injury until the return of their envoys. With these promises made, the twelve citizens went off to their emperor, and the count continued his siege."¹¹¹

When the "twelve citizens" of Varna set out for John Šišman's court at Tirnovo, Amadeo put the Latin Patriarch Paulus at the head of an embassy of his own, and sent with him to Tirnovo the lord of Fromentes, Alebret of Bohemia, Guiot Ferlay, and Gabriel Biblia. They left Varna on 29 October, and on 10 November, shortly after their arrival at Tirnovo, Paulus sent Guiot Ferlay back to Amadeo at Varna, doubtless to report on their reception by the tsar and to seek further instructions.¹¹² The Savoyard envoys did not return until 22 December, when they rejoined Amadeo at Mesembria, whither he had gone in the meantime.¹¹³ A Greek messenger, who had probably left Vidin and gone to Varna by way of Tirnovo, had already brought Amadeo "certain news" from both John V and Šišman on 10 November,¹¹⁴ and the tsar and the emperor had obviously been in communication with each other for many weeks.

The negotiations of the Patriarch Paulus at Tirnovo were as successful as they were satisfactory from the Savoyard viewpoint. Agreement was not too difficult, for Šišman had been fearful for the future of Varna, and Amadeo had been loath to prolong the siege into the winter. Paulus apparently secured the release of Guy de Pontarlier, the marshal of Burgundy, the lord Bartholomé Ballufier, and a certain Poippe, "qui capti detinebantur per imperatorem Burgarie," for a ransom of 2,400 gold *parperi* of the standard weight of Pera or about 1,200 gold ducats.¹¹⁵ The envoys from Varna had given Šišman such a gloomy account of how Amadeo had seized and laid waste Bulgarian "cities, towns, and castles . . . , and was still holding the city of Varna under siege, because

¹⁰⁸ The three *patroni* of the Marseillais galleys received their monthly *stipendia* on 30 October, 1366 (Barbier's accounts, no. 308). Bonzan's death is mentioned in no. 701. Other vessels (*ligna, bargae, panfili, naues*) also appear in Barbier's records (nos. 301, 307, 315, 325, 329).

¹⁰⁹ Barbier's accounts, no. 301, p. 85. Antoine, the "elder bastard of Savoy," an illegitimate son of Amadeo, was made captain of Lemona, which later revolted, "et est sciendum quod idem bastardus captus exitit" (no. 421). The Bulgarians thus recovered the town and castle, "et les emmenerent prisonniers a leur seigneur lempereur de Bugarie en la cite d' Andrenopoly [!], out messire Anthoine chastillain morut de doulour" (Servion, *Chroniques de Savoye*, cols. 313, 317).

¹¹⁰ Barbier's accounts, no. 312.

¹¹¹ Servion, *Chron.*, col. 312, where the taking of Lemona and "le chastel de Colocastre" is placed during the period of Amadeo's encampment before Varna.

¹¹² Barbier's accounts, no. 388, p. 99.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 392, p. 100. As noted below, Amadeo had withdrawn from Varna to Mesembria between 16 and 18 November (nos. 343-45).

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 328, p. 89.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 395, 503. Pontarlier and his companions were being held by the Bulgarians "apud Provat . . . et fuerunt capti apud Galataz versus Vernam" (i.e. near Varna, presumably before 18 November).

[Šišman] was keeping the emperor of Constantinople a prisoner," that the harassed tsar "consented to the deliverance of the emperor . . . , but the count of Savoy should promise no longer to carry on the war at Varna." According to the further testimony of the chroniclers of Savoy, Paulus then conveyed to Šišman the assurance of Amadeo "that as soon as the emperor [John], his cousin, should be at liberty in Constantinople, he would raise his siege before Varna. . . ." ¹¹⁶

Amadeo had withdrawn to Mesembria by 18 November, however, when he gave his cook Palliart three florins as a gift for going out to buy him a woolen jacket and hood. ¹¹⁷ On the twenty-fourth masons received a florin's worth of wine when they built a fireplace in Amadeo's room "in domo ville Mesembrie." ¹¹⁸ At the same time Amadeo made final payments to the skippers of three galleys from Genoa (Isnardo di Gaico, Lanfranco Pansa, and Marco di Canava), who were preparing to return home, and to the two skippers from Pera (Domenico Veyrol and Martino di Campofregoso), whose term of service had also ended. ¹¹⁹ Jean Casse, whose galley hailed from Marseille, was also paid off. ¹²⁰ They were all probably anxious to be gone before the winter set in. On 8 December the tailor Aimonet spent 33 gold parperi on materials for great-coats, hoods, and gloves for Amadeo and Guillaume de Grandson, ¹²¹ which suggests there were some good shops in Mesembria. The vigilant physician Guy Albin found an apothecary shop, and acquired "many medicines . . . for the many sick persons among milord's men," all for 2 florins. ¹²²

While men were being paid off and purchases made, messengers were carrying letters to Constantinople and Pera, to the Emperor John V at Vidin, and to the Bulgarians at Cape Kaliakra, northeast of Varna, "pro adventu domini imperatoris Constantinopolis." ¹²³ With the raising of the siege of Varna, Amadeo sent a trusted member of his suite, Treverneis, with an interpreter and two crossbowmen (*balisterii*) to meet John and accompany him to the Savoyard encampment. Apparently the tsar Šišman would

not yet allow either John or Amadeo's emissaries to traverse Bulgarian territory, and so Treverneis went to Cape Kaliakra, where for twenty-nine days he was to wait in vain for John, who (doubtless with Šišman's permission) was finally able to take a more direct route than the Danube valley, and eventually reached the Black Sea at Sozopolis. When the emperor's route was known, Treverneis returned from Kaliakra, and on or about 24 December he was reimbursed sixteen florins for his expenses and those of his interpreter and crossbowmen. ¹²⁴

In the meantime the payment of the skippers of the galleys, the hirelings placed in the garrisons, and the men-at-arms enlisted in Savoy, Italy, and elsewhere as well as a multiplicity of smaller expenditures (which Barbier carefully records) had exhausted Amadeo's crusading treasury. He therefore exacted a tribute or "tallage" (*taillia*) of 17,568½ gold parperi [about 8,270 gold florins] from Mesembria, which was paid "by many and diverse persons in the city," including 938½ parperi collected from the poor. ¹²⁵ The wealthier citizens were assessed considerable sums, Calojohn Castrophilatas 2,000 parperi, of which he paid 1,200 in food-stuffs; the Lady Theodora 500, of which she also paid 300 in *victualibus*; and Constantine Octolinas 500, the final 100 of which he was apparently able to settle for sixty. ¹²⁶ Amadeo's aides sold 227 "fourths" (*quartae*) of millet, found in the castle of Mesembria, to a local worthy named Andrea Nychodi at "one parperus for each fourth," and a Genoese merchant named Gabriele bought 600 *quartae* of millet, which had also been stored in the castle, for what appears to have been half the price. ¹²⁷ The Savoyards seized and sold copper, salt, wax, barley, wheat, and other things for which a price would be paid, including sour wine. ¹²⁸ The Jews of Mesembria made Amadeo a "gift" of 20 florins (about 42 parperi), and John Acardi paid 24 parperi to avoid having his house pulled down. ¹²⁹

¹¹⁶ Servion, *Chron.*, cols. 313–14.

¹¹⁷ Barbier's accounts, no. 345.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 352. The house received new locks and keys (no. 375).

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 353–56.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 384.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, no. 372, and *cf.* no. 366.

¹²² *Ibid.*, no. 377.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, nos. 357, 360–61, 387.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 387. Treverneis appears often in Barbier's accounts (nos. 244, 859, 1139–42, 1182). Amadeo had sent him in late November "to the emperor of Constantinople at Vidin" (no. 361), but presumably Šišman would not allow him to go farther than Kaliakra.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, no. XIII. As previously noted, in Barbier's accounts receipts are listed in Roman and expenditures in Arabic numerals.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. XIV–XVI. Some persons were imprisoned until they paid their assessments (no. 371, and *cf.* no. 394).

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. VIII–IX.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. XXIX–XXXIV, XXXVI, XLIII–XLVI.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. XXIV–XXV.

Girard de Grandmont collected 2,734¾ parperi from the inhabitants of Anchialus, "and he could not get more from them, as he says, although the tribute amounted to a larger sum, because of the hardship which the population of the city suffered at the hands of the people whom the lord [Amadeo] kept in the garrison of the city."¹³⁰ Girard had done his best. One night toward Christmas (1366) he had stationed several of Galeazzo Visconti's *briganti* to guard a church in which he had confined some of the more reluctant and probably richer citizens of Anchialus "for the lord Amadeo's tribute." The *briganti* received an extra florin for their trouble, and an unnamed interpreter received 2 florins for assisting Girard to collect a "certain part of the aforesaid tribute." On Christmas eve Girard hired a boat to take him from Anchialus to Mesembria, presumably to bring Amadeo some of the needed money, and then he returned in the same boat, very likely to get some more.¹³¹ Another interpreter, Francesc of Catalonia, collected 1,100 parperi from the inhabitants of Lemona, where he lived, and handed the money over to Barbier "for the tribute levied on them by the lord Amadeo."¹³²

As the days got colder, and the north wind swept in from the Black Sea, more fireplaces were installed and the windows were weather-proofed in the house which Amadeo was occupying at Mesembria.¹³³ The hours passed slowly. Amadeo bought a crossbow from one of the Genoese, and gave 18 silver *denarii* in Bulgarian money to some crossbowmen "qui cum domino luserunt ad balistam."¹³⁴ He acquired a white falcon,¹³⁵ and idled away the hours by gambling with his friends.¹³⁶ At Varna on 6 November he had borrowed 200 florins from Archeto di Val d' Aosta, and now at Mesembria on 3 December he borrowed another hundred from his physician Guy Albin.¹³⁷ Albin was busy that December, for most of the Savoyard and Italian troopers had fewer fireplaces in their quarters, and very likely none had such a coat as the one with the deerskin lining and the fox-fur collar, on which Amadeo's tailor had spent 3½ florins

at Pera three months before.¹³⁸ Apparently influenza descended on the host, and Albin bought "many medicines" during their stay at Mesembria; one of the nobles died, and Amadeo's young son, the "junior bastard of Savoy," fell ill. Antelme d'Urtières got sick at Christmas; he was to take 35 gold ducats' worth of medicine by Easter, and his infirmity would last until after the expedition had returned to Italy.¹³⁹

Toward the end of December the long-awaited news came that the Emperor John V would soon reach the shores of the Black Sea. It may have been brought to Mesembria by "certain minstrels of the lord emperor of Constantinople," to whom Amadeo gave 3 florins on the thirty-first. John would be coming to Sozopolis, and on or about 9 January (1367) Amadeo crossed the Gulf of Burgas to await him there.¹⁴⁰ The Patriarch Paulus had already returned from his Bulgarian mission, and from 23 to 27 January he joined Amadeo at dinner with Guillaume de Grandson, Gaspard de Montmayeur, Alebret of Bohemia, "and several other nobles." They discussed the *negotia* which they were going to take up with John, and dined in the evenings to the extent of 102 *solidi*, including the cost of six wax torches weighing 33 pounds and 13 pounds of small candles. Jean de Grolée also appeared on 28 January, at which time the emperor himself either arrived at Sozopolis or at least became available for discussions with the Savoyards. Barbier has recorded the expenses incurred "in the said town of Sozopolis for the eighteen days during which [the lord Amadeo] stayed there for certain negotiations conducted with the lord emperor of Constantinople, beginning on the evening of 28 January and ending on 15 February."¹⁴¹ Amadeo appears to have returned to Mesembria by 22 February,¹⁴² but these discussions were resumed later on (for three days, from 12 to 15 March) by Paulus and the sire de Fromentes.¹⁴³

The two cousins and their advisers had much to talk about, from the costs of the Savoyard

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, no. XXIII.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, no. 405.

¹³² *Ibid.*, no. XII.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, no. 393.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 369–70. Amadeo paid nine parperi for his crossbow.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 389.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. 302–4, 317, 336, 341, 951.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. XXXVIII–XXXIX, both loans being made "absque litera vel instrumento de debito."

¹³⁸ Cf., *ibid.*, no. 273. Amadeo and Guillaume de Grandson were well clothed (cf. also no. 401).

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 377, 407, 605, 762–63.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 410–11.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, nos. 419–20. The Patriarch Paulus seems to have returned to Varna after his mission to Tirnovo, for on 17 December twenty-six Marseillais mariners were paid for a seven days' trip to Varna and back "ad dominum patriarcham Constantinopolis" (nos. 379–80), although he apparently did not rejoin Amadeo until 22 December (no. 392).

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, nos. 423 ff.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, no. 441.

expedition to the doctrine of papal supremacy. John V was happy to recover the former Byzantine cities of Mesembria and Sozopolis, for which Amadeo wanted some reimbursement for his huge expenditures on the crusade. When in March (1367) Amadeo turned Mesembria over to John, he received some 20,844 parperi towards the 15,000 florins (=31,875 parperi), which John had agreed to give him in partial payment of the costs of the galleys.¹⁴⁴ In this connection Barbier notes that "nichil plus recuperare potuit ab eodem [domino imperatore]," but even to meet two-thirds of such a financial obligation was an extraordinary accomplishment for the always-impooverished emperor.

In dealing with the financial question the sire de Fromentes had clearly been Amadeo's chief spokesman. But since John had undertaken to effect the union of the Churches in return for substantial aid against the Turks, both Amadeo and the Patriarch Paulus now pressed him to live up to this solemn commitment. To have expelled the Turks from Gallipoli and the Bulgarians from Mesembria and Sozopolis was no mean feat, and the addition of these strongholds to the shrunken empire of Byzantium was the work of Latin warriors, who had also rescued John from his dilemma at Vidin. John was expected to keep his part of the bargain, and the union of the Churches was the chief topic of the long discussions at Sozopolis. Amadeo and Paulus both served as spokesmen for Urban V, who was then getting ready to move the papacy back to Rome. But to the ecclesiastical problem, which was certain to create discord in Constantinople, and John's

attempted solution of it we shall return presently.

Amadeo spent from 22 February to at least 19 March at Mesembria, but on 31 March he was back in Sozopolis, when he ordered Barbier to pay 34 florins for the expenses of thirty armed men and some archers who were to accompany him on his return to Constantinople.¹⁴⁵ On 6 April Amadeo was apparently back at "L' Orfenal" (Rumelifeneri), from which place a messenger was sent overland with letters to the Genoese podestà at Pera and to Gaspard de Montmayeur, who had preceded him to Constantinople.¹⁴⁶ By 9 April Amadeo had returned to the Byzantine capital, where John V and the Greek populace gave him a heartfelt welcome. John thanked him for "les biens que vous aves fait a la christiente, et principalement a moy."¹⁴⁷ In Constantinople Amadeo found a charger and some silk cloth which Francesco Gattilusio had sent him as a gift by two servitors, to whom Barbier gave 6 florins.¹⁴⁸ More bills were paid, and on the twenty-sixth of the month Amadeo made a present of 1,800 gold parperi to Aimon III of Geneva and to the latter's cousin Aimon of Geneva-Athon.¹⁴⁹ This time Amadeo took up his residence in the suburbs of Pera, in the house of Marco de' Einaudi's widow, to whom he gave 54 gold parperi as he got ready to leave (two months later),¹⁵⁰ but he made frequent trips across the Golden Horn,¹⁵¹ presumably to confer with John V in the imperial palace. There were more shopping sprees, and large quantities of cloth were again purchased at the workshop of Bernabò di S. Stefano.¹⁵² Among the various purchases made for Amadeo were two little slave girls, who cost 72 gold parperi.¹⁵³ A financial settlement was finally made with the Patriarch Paulus, and on 8 May Amadeo repaid him the 1,600 gold parperi which he had advanced to provide supplies and wages for the garrison at Gallipoli.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. XL–XLII, XLVII–XLIX. Barbier gives sums amounting to 20,844 parperi as having been received from imperial agents, but in entry no. XLIX he reckons the total *recepta* from John V as only 20,300, but the discrepancy is not very large, and is presumably to be accounted for by the fact that the imperial payments were made according to both the *pondus Romanie* and the *pondus Pere*. Barbier's accounts are full of problems of "foreign exchange."

The Bulgarians had occupied Mesembria and Sozopolis (as well as Anchialus) in 1307; these places were especially valuable as centers of a grain-growing region. After Amadeo's departure, Mesembria and Sozopolis (as well as Anchialus) were occupied by the Turks sometime before 1380, but were recovered by the Byzantines as a result of Manuel II's treaty with the Emir Suleiman in 1403. In 1413, after the elimination of his brother Musa, the new Sultan Mehmed I confirmed Manuel in possession of them (*cf.* A. E. Bakalopoulos, "Les Limites de l'empire byzantin depuis la fin du XIV^e siècle jusqu'à sa chute (1453)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LV (1962), 56–62).

¹⁴⁵ Barbier's accounts, nos. 423 ff., 444 ff., 447, and *cf.* nos. 448, 490.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 449.

¹⁴⁷ Servion, *Chron.*, col. 314c.

¹⁴⁸ Barbier's accounts, no. 450.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 459, and *cf.* no. 723, and Setton, in *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 646, note.

¹⁵⁰ Barbier's accounts, no. 570.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, no. 468.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, nos. 471, 491, 493–94. The enterprising Bernabò also bought and sold grain (nos. 606–7).

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, no. 499.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 500.

The crusade was nearing its end, but Amadeo now turned his attention once more to the Turks, from whom on 14 May his forces seized (and unfurled his banner atop) the tower of "Eneacossia," which his contemporary John Cantacuzenus twice identifies for us as "the fortress near Rhegium," the modern Kūçukçekmece,¹⁵⁵ on the northern (European) side of the Marmara. About ten days later they burned the Turkish stronghold called "Caloneyro," of which the Byzantine ruin near Büyüçekmece possibly marks the location.¹⁵⁶ This was the last offensive against the Turks. Amadeo's funds were depleted, but he was trying to repay some of the debts he owed the Genoese at Pera.¹⁵⁷ Men were dying, including his cook, who was buried in the Franciscan church at Pera; Amadeo spent the respectable sum of 40 florins on his funeral.¹⁵⁸ Others were ill, and as he prepared to send back Galeazzo Visconti's *briganti* to Venice,¹⁵⁹ Amadeo made generous provision for those who were *infirmirate gravati*, and whom he would have to leave behind at Pera.¹⁶⁰ Some of his followers wished to go on to Cyprus, presumably to join Peter I in his crusading efforts, and each of them received parting gifts of 50, 120, or 200 gold parperi.¹⁶¹ On Ascension Day (3 June) Antoine, the "younger bastard of Savoy," spent 85 parperi on a farewell banquet at Pera for "many nobles," and Barbier paid the bill two days later.¹⁶²

Finally, on 9 June (1367), Amadeo boarded a galley at Pera for the return voyage to Venice. Stopping off at Gallipoli, he discharged his many debts to the officers and men of the garrison, and on 14 June he turned the fortress town over to the "people of the lord emperor of Constantinople."¹⁶³ Barbier's accounts locate him at

Tenedos on 16 June, and on the twenty-first and twenty-second at Negroponte, where he gave 4 gold parperi to two minstrels of Roger de Lluria, the vicar-general of the Catalan duchy of Athens; the minstrels doubtless brought Amadeo the greetings of de Lluria, and provided an evening's entertainment.¹⁶⁴ Thereafter we find both Amadeo and his accountant at Coron and Modon, whence he sailed around the western prong of the Moreote peninsula to Glarentza, where on 5 July he contributed 20 solidi Venetian to the local hospital.¹⁶⁵ On 10 July he was at Corfu,¹⁶⁶ on the fourteenth at Durazzo, and on the seventeenth at Ragusa, where he kissed the relics which the Dominicans showed him,¹⁶⁷ and where he left behind some of his sick followers, giving them all large sums of money but not informing Barbier "whether it is a loan, a gift, or in payment of a debt."¹⁶⁸ He reached the island of Lesina (*Alesna*) off the Dalmatian coast on 21 July, Zara on the twenty-fourth, and the Istrian port of Rovigno on the twenty-eighth.¹⁶⁹ Now the voyage was over, for his galley soon landed at S. Niccolò di Lido, and he re-entered the city of Venice on 31 July.¹⁷⁰ He had made history, and done it well.

Before coming to the importance of Amadeo's expedition from the standpoint of the Curia Romana, we may note that Amadeo remained at Venice (with a trip to Treviso) until 8 September,¹⁷¹ making more or less final payments to various *patroni* of the galleys which had gone on the expedition, discharging innumerable

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 515, and Cantacuzenus, *Hist.*, I, 45, and II, 34 (Bonn, I, 219, 505): "τὸ περὶ τὸ Πήγιον Ἐννακόσια προστραγορευόμενον χωρίον." On Rhegium-Kūçukçekmece, near the present-day airport, see Mamboury, *Istanbul touristique* (1951), pp. 569-72.

¹⁵⁶ Barbier's accounts, no. 523, and cf. Mamboury, *Istanbul touristique*, p. 573.

¹⁵⁷ Barbier's accounts, nos. 526 ff.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 492, and cf. nos. 469, 583-85, 589, 608-10.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 501-2.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 504-5, 510, 576.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, nos. 509, 535, 537, 540, et alibi. Antoine, the younger bastard, went to Cyprus from Negroponte; he received 600 parperi (no. 654).

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, no. 558.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, nos. 612-13 and ff. Amadeo traveled in the new galley which Giovanni di Conte had purchased at Pera (nos. 867, 900, 922).

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 650 and 654, p. 157, where the date line "apud Nigrum Pontem die XXII mensis Julii" is a *lapsus calami* for 22 June, and see also no. 1197.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 654, p. 158, and nos. 656-58.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 663, where the editor Bollati has one of his fatuous geographical notes, identifying Barbier's *Curfo* with "Korghos . . . sulla costa della Cilicia!"

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. 669-70, and cf. B. Krekić, "Amadeo VI of Savoy, the 'Green Count,' at Dubrovnik in 1367" (in Serbocroatian), *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta*, XIII (1971), 207-11.

¹⁶⁸ Barbier's accounts, no. 676.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 678, 682, 686. He had touched at Pola on 27 July (no. 690). Lesina is today the well-known island resort of Hvar. By the treaty of Zara (in 1358) it went to Louis the Great of Hungary, under whose rule it was at the time of Amadeo's landing.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 691-92.

¹⁷¹ The last payments Barbier made at Venice on Amadeo's instructions are dated 8 September, 1367 (nos. 898 ff.), on which day Amadeo left the city (no. 917). On 19 August the Senate had granted Amadeo permission to go to Treviso "pro recreatione sua" (Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 68^v). Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (1930), p. 160, note 4, states that he went there on the nineteenth.

debts, making gifts, and buying things. In Venice his physician Guy Albin died, and on 13 August Amadeo gave him an elaborate funeral in the church of the Friars Minor.¹⁷² A week later, on the nineteenth, he gave a gold ducat to the gondolier who brought him back "from the house of [Philippe de Mézières], the chancellor of Cyprus, where he had dined."¹⁷³ They doubtless talked of the Cypriote sack of Alexandria and of Amadeo's own occupation of Gallipoli, Sozopolis, and Mesembria. They must also have discussed the union of the Churches. The Latin Patriarch Paulus was in Venice. Amadeo paid a hundred ducats for a gray palfrey, which he gave to Paulus, and he wrote Urban V, who was then at Viterbo, urging the needy patriarch's nomination to the lucrative archiepiscopal see of Patras, which had fallen vacant with the death of Angelo Acciajuoli.¹⁷⁴ His efforts were not in vain, for on 20 October the pope appointed Paulus administrator of the see.¹⁷⁵ He had been useful to the papacy in the discussions of church union at Sozopolis and Constantinople.¹⁷⁶

From Barbier's accounts one can easily follow Amadeo's subsequent itinerary in Italy until the day of his return to Chambéry.¹⁷⁷ The chief

purpose of his southward journey was to see Urban V, whom he found in the handsome palace at Viterbo in early October, and thereafter to visit some of the historic churches in Rome. According to the pope's so-called *prima vita*, "Urban being still at Viterbo, there came to him the well-known Amadeo, the count of Savoy, and [Paulus], the patriarch of Constantinople, and some other notable persons sent on behalf of the emperor of Constantinople, promising the pope . . . that the emperor would return to the unity of the Roman Church, and that in this connection he would shortly come in person to the pope."¹⁷⁸ The other "notable persons" to whom the pope's biographer refers are the eight Byzantine envoys who had sailed with Amadeo on the return voyage to Venice.¹⁷⁹

Soon after his arrival in Rome on 13 October (1367) Amadeo began a tour of the Roman churches, starting with S. Silvestro, where he kissed the head of S. John the Baptist, and thereafter went on to S. Maria in Aracoeli, S. Paolo alla Regola, and S. Anastasio. He repaid certain debts to the Patriarch Paulus, and gave 300 florins to Marie of Bourbon, the titular Latin empress of Constantinople. He remained in Rome until 25 October,¹⁸⁰ and so witnessed Urban V's return to the city on the sixteenth,¹⁸¹

¹⁷² Barbier's accounts, no. 1187.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, no. 761.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 793, p. 182, and no. 804.

¹⁷⁵ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 394.

¹⁷⁶ Paulus's doctrinal learning and skill in disputation won the admiration of the anti-Latin Nicephorus Gregoras, XXIX, 55 ff. (Bonn, III, 262 ff.): ". . . σοφίας ἔμπειρος ἐπόση καὶ οἶα τὴν τῶν Λατίνων οἰκειοῦται σχολὴν ἐν δογματικαῖς τῶν θεῶν γραμμάτων διατριβαῖς." Gregoras does not mention Paulus by name, but the identification is certain (cf. ed. Bonn, I, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii; Giovanni Mercati, *Simone Atumano*, Rome, 1916, pp. 30–31, note; Ant. Rubió i Lluch, in the *Homenaje a D. Carmelo de Echegaray*, San Sebastian, 1928, pp. 370, 382). From Smyrna (1345–1357), Paulus was translated to Thebes, and thence to the Latin patriarchate (1366–1370), with an official residence at Negroponte (Eubel, I, 206, 456, 482).

¹⁷⁷ From Venice Amadeo went to Padua, where we find him on 9–10 September, 1367 (Barbier's accounts, nos. 919 ff., 1211). He was at Ferrara on the twelfth and thirteenth (*ibid.*, nos. 929, 933), Piacenza on the sixteenth (nos. 941, 1198), Pavia from the eighteenth to the twenty-third (nos. 944 ff., 992), Borgo S. Donnino on the twenty-fourth (nos. 1008, 1211), Fornovo di Taro on the twenty-fifth (no. 1011), Pontremoli from the twenty-sixth to the twenty-eighth (nos. 1012, 1211), and Lucca on the thirtieth (no. 1015), when he went on to Pisa (no. 1017), where he remained 1–2 October (nos. 1018, 1021). His next stop was Siena on 3 October (no. 1025), whence he continued to Montefiascone, where we find him on the seventh (no. 1029). He spent from the seventh to the eleventh at Viterbo (nos. 1030 ff., 1043), where he and Paulus con-

ferred with Urban V (see the following note). His next stop was Rome, where he arrived on 13 October, and remained until the twenty-fifth (nos. 1048–69). Returning north by way of Montefiascone (no. 1074) and Civitavecchia (no. 1075), he reached Perugia on 29 October (no. 1077), Arezzo on the thirty-first (no. 1083), and Florence on 2 November (no. 1085). He was at Bologna on the sixth (no. 1096), Mantua on the ninth (no. 1100), Borgo S. Donnino on the eleventh (nos. 1105, 1211), and back in Pavia from the fourteenth to the twenty-third (nos. 1108 ff., 1122). He stopped at Vercelli on 24 November (no. 1145), and the following day went on to Ivrea (nos. 1152 ff., 1156), after which he turned south to Rivoli, where he was on 4 December (no. 1172). Four days later, on the eighth, he was at Susa (no. 1176), whence he proceeded through the Mont Cenis Pass to Lanlebourg (no. 1178), reaching Aiguebelle on 8 December (no. 1181) and Chambéry on the tenth (no. 1182).

¹⁷⁸ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I (1914), 364. The author of the *Secunda vita Urbani V* informs us that with Amadeo and Paulus "octo ambaxiatores imperatoris Constantinopolitani" waited upon the pope at Viterbo on 7 October, 1367 (*ibid.*, I, 388).

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 64^r, dated 6 August, 1367: "Capta: Quod magnifico domino comiti Sabaudie hoc instanter requirenti concedatur quod sua comitiva et greci qui secum venerunt possint redire ad partes suas solum cum arnesiis absque mercationibus. . . ." Cf. the previous note and Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, p. 160, who has already noted this text.

¹⁸⁰ Barbier's accounts, nos. 1048, 1052, 1063–65, 1069.

¹⁸¹ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 365, 388.

the Byzantine envoys following along in the papal train.

The envoys, laymen as well as ecclesiastics, represented both the Emperor John V and the Greek Patriarch Philotheus Coccinus. The negotiations begun in Viterbo were continued in Rome, but the participants apparently avoided the theological difficulties which had proved insurmountable in the past. The envoys were probably divided in their instructions and their objectives, for the interests of the *ekklesia* and the *basileia*, as seen by Philotheus and John, corresponded less closely than the latter might have wished. The series of twenty-three bulls promulgated by Urban on 6 November, however, bear witness to the optimistic view of the prospects for church union which still prevailed at the Curia Romana after these discussions,¹⁸² and therefore to the forbearance of the ecclesiastical members of the Byzantine mission. The latter knew that they could afford to wait for the formal sessions of the oecumenical council which, as we shall see, they had doubtless been informed would be the final and indispensable forum for the settlement of doctrinal differences. These differences were chiefly the Latin defense of papal supremacy within the Church, the *filioque* clause and the form of invocation (*ἐπίκλησις*) of the Holy Spirit, the Latin *azyma* as opposed to the Greek use of leavened bread in the mass, and the denial of purgatory and opposition to indulgences. The papacy on the other hand objected to the convocation of a general council at this time—among other reasons the political turbulence in Italy made the idea impracticable—and so it would take more than John's promised appearance at the Curia to effect the union of the Churches.

For years the papacy had set the union of the Churches as the price which the Greeks must pay for a large-scale expedition against the Turks. If in some respects the Savoyard "crusade" fell short of Greek hopes, it had managed no small achievement against both the Turks and the Bulgarians. For years the Emperor John had made clear that he was willing to pay the price—ever since the negotiations in 1355, in which Paulus, then archbishop of Smyrna, had played a leading role—and while still at Sozopolis and Constantinople Count Amadeo of Savoy and

Paulus believed that they had found a way of holding John to this commitment. Amadeo had needed money to get his expedition back to Italy, and instead of borrowing it himself, he and Paulus had prevailed upon John to do so, before the cession of Sozopolis, Mesembria, and Gallipoli. An agreement was thus reached whereby John loaned Amadeo "20,000 florins of good weight [=42,500 gold parperi], to be repaid within one month after the lord emperor or his son the lord Andronicus shall have come before the lord pope." It obviously took some time to find the money, but at length John succeeded in borrowing from two Genoese bankers (*banquerii*) in Pera the sum of 34,862 gold parperi (=16,405 florins), which he turned over to Amadeo on 29 May, 1367,¹⁸³ enabling the latter to complete his plans for the return to Venice. It was of course a goodly sum, and Amadeo doubtless helped persuade the bankers to make the loan, for the emperor's credit was not very good. John was still short some 3,600 florins (=7,650 parperi), which he had partially made up by pledging some precious stones and jewelry, including the large ruby he used to wear in his hat. The jewels were left with Amadeo's consent on deposit with the magistrates of the commune of Pera. The two instruments setting forth the imperial obligations, prepared by the notary Baldassano Niccoli, were redeemed for 50 parperi by Amadeo on 4 June, five days before he left Pera.¹⁸⁴

Although the acts prepared by the notary Niccoli appear no longer to be extant, the background of these negotiations is given in a letter of Urban V to the podestà and council of Pera. The letter is dated 16 November, 1369, a month after John V's appearance at the Curia in Rome and his public acceptance of Latin Catholicism (and almost twenty months after he had agreed to come). From this letter it is clear that, in the event he failed to keep his promise, John would cede to Amadeo the right to the imperial customs duties (*commercia*) for five years, since at least some of the precious stones and jewels he had pledged and deposited with the magistrates of Pera were "of small value." By Novem-

¹⁸² Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 249, fols. 1–4, 10–12, on which see Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 163, 166–75, 178 ff.

¹⁸³ Barbier's accounts, no. LXXIII, pp. 15–16. The rate was about 17 parperi to 8 florins, "computatis decem septem [parperis] pro octo florenis boni ponderis" (cf., *ibid.*, no. CXVII, p. 25).

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 555, pp. 135–36. For the ruby (*balassius grossus*), "quem idem imperator super capello suo deferre solebat," see Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, app., no. 15, p. 380 (cf. the following note).

ber, 1369, John's formal conversion had abrogated his commitment to give Amadeo the imperial customs rights for five years, and of course he wanted also the restitution of the "jewels thus pledged" (*iocalia sic pignolata*). "And therefore supplication has been humbly made to us on the said emperor's behalf," Urban wrote the colonial government of Pera, "that since he has himself come to us according to his promise, we should order the aforesaid jewels to be restored to him," which Urban directed the addressees of his letter to do promptly.¹⁸⁵

The discussions which we have seen take place at Sozopolis from the evening of 28 January to 15 February (1367) between John V and Amadeo, together with their staffs, inevitably caused some commotion in the Byzantine Church. In April or May Philotheus Coccinus, the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, wrote his beloved brother Gregory, the metropolitan of Ochrida "and of all Bulgaria" to the following effect:

The beloved cousin of my most excellent and holy emperor, the count of Savoy, having arrived with his galleys in Constantinople, the city aggrandized and guarded by God, has had with him also the western bishop, the lord Paulus. He brought a letter from the pope to my most excellent and holy emperor concerning the union and concord of the Churches, that is to say, of our own Church and that of the Latins.

The emperor had shown the letter to Philotheus and to the Patriarchs Niphon of Alexandria and Lazarus of Jerusalem, who were then in Constantinople, and a synod had been formed with other bishops who happened also to be in the city. Thus, assembling and finding themselves in full agreement, the Byzantine divines had voted that an oecumenical council must be convoked to deal with so grave a matter, after the fashion of the first seven such councils (the only ones ever recognized by the Orthodox Churches). The Patriarchs Niphon and Lazarus were sending letters to their suffragans and local synods, summoning them to attend the council. The three patriarchs had of course sent word to their fourth confrère, the patriarch of Antioch, so that he might come with his suffragans and the members of the Antiochene synod. His Holiness of Ochrida should

also come with his suffragans, since it was to be a "catholic and oecumenical council." Although Philotheus writes sympathetically of the possibility of union, in rehearsing the Greek position, he does state that he and his fellow ecclesiastics would not accept the omission of a syllable or an iota of the Orthodox dogmas. They would rely solely upon the gospels, the apostolic and patristic texts, and the ancient ecclesiastical legislation, preserving in their full integrity both the *ekklesia* and the *basileia*. Philotheus expressed confidence that the Greek interpretations of the sacred texts would prove superior to those of the Latins, and if so, "they may come along with us, and acknowledge it" (*ἐλθωσιν ἐκείνοι μεθ' ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογήσωσιν*),¹⁸⁶ a very unlikely prospect if we can trust Nicephorus Gregoras's low opinion of the intellectual capacity of the Greek episcopate of his time.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶ Franz Miklosich and Jos. Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi: Acta patriarchatus constantinopolitani*, I (Vienna, 1860, repr. Aalen, 1968), no. CCXXXIV, pp. 491–93, undated, but assigned to April or May, 1367, by Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, p. 152. See also the letters of Urban V given in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1367, nos. 9–11, vol. VII (1752), pp. 153–54, especially Urban's letter of 6 November, 1367, to Philotheus, Niphon, and Lazarus in answer to an obviously most conciliatory letter which they had sent to Rome. The pope professes to believe that they are ready for the "reductio Graecorum ad sacrosanctae Romanae ac universalis ecclesiae unitatem," which was obviously far from the case.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), p. 41. As is well known, Gregoras's public career was ruined by his stalwart opposition to the obscurantist Palamite leadership of the Church in his time (for his excommunication, see the *Acta patriarchatus constantinopolitani*, I, no. CCXXIX, p. 490, and R. Guiland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras*, Paris, 1926, pp. 34–40 and ff.). Gregoras died toward the end of 1359 or possibly at the beginning of the following year. On Philotheus Coccinus, Gregoras, and the theological contests of their time, see in general the learned work of the late Cardinal Giovanni Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone . . . ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*, Città del Vaticano, 1931 (Studi e testi, no. 56).

Reference has already been made (see above, note 24) to the text published by J. Meyendorff, "Projets de concile oecuménique en 1367," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XIV, 164–77, in which Paulus is represented as having had an audience with John VI Cantacuzenus, in June, 1367, in the palace of Blachernae. If their theological discussion really took place, it must have been during the first week of June, because Paulus sailed with Amadeo from Pera on the ninth. The writer exhibits the former emperor and the Latin patriarch as carrying on their dialogue (*dialexis*) in the presence of John V Palaeologus, the Empress Helena, the young co-emperor Andronicus [IV], the Despot Manuel [II], officials of the palace and the patriarchate, as well as the bishops of Ephesus, Heraclea, and Adrianople. Canta-

¹⁸⁵ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Aven. 172, fols. 345^v–346^r, and Reg. Vat. 260, fol. 3, no. 9, published by Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, app., no. 15, pp. 380–81, and see, *ibid.*, pp. 149–51 for a fuller statement of the facts which I have simplified.

The Savoyard crusade moved the cautious Emperor John to take further steps of his own for the defense of the empire. In November, 1367, the lord Macarius Glabas Tarchaneiotes, John's uncle and the most exalted of Byzantine monks, informed the Patriarch Philotheus that John wanted to plant soldiers (*καταστήσαι στρατιώτας*) along the northern shore of the Sea of Marmara from the walls of the capital westward to Selymbria, the modern Silivri. He was planning to give the soldiers the lands involved, as *pronoiai* or military estates, including two villages (*χωρία*) which belonged to the Great Church. John asked for the cession of these villages for a year, and if he used them as he proposed, he would of course retain them longer, but he would then give the Church an indemnity equal to their revenue. Otherwise he would return them to the Church. Philotheus replied that he could not give up the two villages, for he was only the custodian and not the proprietor of ecclesiastical estates. The holy synod was assembled, and speaking in support of the patriarch "as if with one mouth" declared that the canons absolutely forbade the alienation of church property. When Tarchaneiotes suggested that the emperor be allowed to rent the properties in question (to settle soldiers on them), the synod answered that the canons also forbade the leasing of ecclesiastical estates to the powerful (*δυνατοί*), even to the emperor (for in earlier generations recovery had proved too difficult). The patriarch and the synod were rigid, but apparently not unwilling to be helpful. They pointed out to Tarchaneiotes that, although they themselves could not violate the canons by giving up the villages, "if the holy emperor wishes to take them on his own authority to do what he proposes, let him do so: it is he who gave them to the Church; let him also take them back if he wishes; he has the power to do with them as he chooses. . . ." ¹⁸⁸

cuzenus propounds with skill, eloquence, tolerance, and benignity the Greek view that the union of the Churches must await the resolution of doctrinal differences, and that this could only be accomplished in an oecumenical council. Cantacuzenus soon convinces Paulus of the rightness and righteousness of the Greek position, and the latter, who is portrayed as rather dim-witted, agrees to a council which should be held in Constantinople within the next two years.

¹⁸⁸ *Acta patriarchatus constantinopolitani*, I, no. CCLII, pp. 507-8, on which note Peter Charanis, "The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, IV (Washington, D.C., 1948), 114-16, and

It is not clear that John availed himself of this rationalization which was designed to protect church property as well as to help build a bulwark against Turkish attacks. Amadeo's recovery of Gallipoli would be a great boon to the Greeks, who (if their strength proved equal to the opportunity) might now prevent the easy passage of Turkish troops back and forth across the Dardanelles, and the new military settlements along the northern Marmara (if they were ever organized) would add to the protection of Constantinople.

The general council which the Patriarch Philotheus wanted never took place, because Urban V could see no point in a theological contest. The doctrines of the true Church were clear enough to the Holy See, and although Urban now hoped for union, he knew that over the centuries dozens of unionist debates had failed to find a solution to the distressing problem of schism. But John V would come to the Curia Romana, as he had promised Amadeo and Paulus. Without our questioning his religious sincerity, on which Halecki has probably laid rather too much emphasis, John had several other good reasons for coming. He wanted further assistance against the Turks. He needed the repayment of the 16,400 florins he had borrowed from the bankers at Pera on Amadeo's behalf, and he was anxious to forestall the necessity of having to turn over to Amadeo the imperial customs revenues for five years.

Although twenty years before this, according to Nicephorus Gregoras, the imperial customs returns (*φόροι*) had already fallen to 30,000 *hyperpyra* a year (while the Genoese at Pera were allegedly collecting nearly 200,000 at their customs office), ¹⁸⁹ such tolls, however reduced, doubtless provided one of John's chief sources of income. Finally there was the additional pledge of his precious stones and jewelry which he would be happy to redeem. For some twenty-five years, ever since the summer of 1343, the Venetians had been holding his "crown jewels" (*κόσμια τῆς βασιλείας, iocalia imperii*) for the non-payment of a debt of 30,000 ducats. Indeed, in February, 1369, the Senate had written the Republic's ambassador Jacopo Bragadin, who had been sent to Constantinople the preceding spring, in rather peremptory tones about

George Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'Histoire de la féodalité byzantine*, trans. Henri Grégoire, Brussels, 1954, p. 160.

¹⁸⁹ Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, XVII, 1, 2 (Bonn, II, 842).

these jewels: Bragadin could tell John to send an envoy to Venice to watch them all sold at auction unless he satisfied their claims against him.¹⁰⁰

The Senate had sent Bragadin in late April, 1368, to the court of John V in order to negotiate the renewal of the Republic's quinquennial truce with Byzantium. The effort had failed, and John was more fearful than the Venetians as to the possible consequences. Perhaps while he was in Italy he could iron out his differences with the Senate, whose instructions to Bragadin may not have been entirely unknown to the Byzantine court. As the ambassador was being sent off on his mission, he had been told to investigate the possibility of the Venetians' acquiring the port of Scutari, just across the Bosphorus from Constantinople, as a concession from Murad I. Reliable informants had reported that the latter was willing to give them a suitable trading station in Turkish territory. Scutari would be an appropriate place. It had a good harbor, across the entrance to which a chain could be thrown to prevent hostile entry. But the Venetians were apparently too self-seeking in their demands of the Turks, and nothing came of this attempt to secure a fortified port under the Ottoman banner. Bragadin's mission, then, was a failure when it came to Scutari as well as to renewal of the Veneto-Byzantine truce. The fault was presumably less his than that of the Senate, whose instructions he had to follow.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 8^v, dated 23 February, 1369: "Tunc dicat [ambaxiator noster] ei quod si sibi placet, potest mittere nuntium suum ad videndum vendi ipsa [localia] pignora, quia nostre intentionis omnino non est plus differre." Since the Palaeologi were supposed to be paying 5 per cent interest on the debt, now more than twenty-five years in arrears (1343–1368), the total amounted to something over 67,500 ducats (at simple interest), on which see below and the excellent article of Tommaso Bertelè, "I Gioielli della corona bizantina dati in pegno alla repubblica veneta nel secolo XIV e Mastino II della Scala," *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*, II (Milan, 1962), 123–24, and doc. no. 31, p. 175, with the text of the senatorial resolution of 23 February, 1369. The Senate had already threatened several times to put the jewels up for sale, but in fact never did so (Bertelè, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, ff.).

¹⁰¹ Misti, Reg. 32, fols. 119^v–122^r, on which note Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 176–77, who in my opinion exaggerates "l'extrême brutalité avec laquelle [Bragadin] avait traité l'empereur." Bragadin's instructions had been to conduct his embassy "cum verbis benivolencie et amoris" (Reg. cit., fol. 119^v), but he found John rather baffling to deal with, "et ipse imperator per formam dictarum treuguarum teneatur nobis solvere certam quantitatem pecunie ad summam ypperperorum xxv m. vi c. lxiii quos solvere debebat ad certos terminos" (*loc. cit.*). No such payments, however, had been made on this debt of 25,663 *hyperperi*.

Insofar as John V was apprised of Bragadin's approach to the Turks, he must have been frightened. With a commercial base at Turkish Scutari, when would the Venetians ever again transport a crusading army into eastern waters?

On 6 August, 1369, the Emperor John landed at Castellammare, on the southern shore of the bay of Naples, with a large retinue of Byzantine nobles. They came in four galleys. After more than a week as the guest of Joanna I in the Castelnovo on the waterfront in Naples, John went back aboard his galley (on 18 August) to continue the voyage to Rome,¹⁰² where he arrived some time in September. On 6 October the Venetian Senate voted to send two envoys to him to try to renew the quinquennial truce. John wanted to settle the matter; he had recently written to Venice, and had apparently asked the Latin Patriarch Paulus to do so also.¹⁰³ One can imag-

By 10 November (1368), to be sure, John had finally paid 4,500 *hyperperi*, but Bragadin and the Senate were indignant "quod [imperator] non vult quod revocetur quod nostri possint habere ultra xv tabernas nec possint emere possessiones, terras, zardinos, et campos . . ." (Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 8^v). This was the old grievance under which the Venetians chafed at each renewal of the treaty. On Bragadin's difficulties at the imperial court, note Julian Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi," *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 283–84, 296–97, 304, 322.

In a resolution of 26 April (1368) the Senate acted on information previously supplied by the Venetian bailie and councillors in Constantinople "quod Moratus condam Orchani libenter vellet quod conversaremur in partibus suis, et esset contentus dare nobis quemdam locum ad velle nostrum in partibus Turchie . . ." (Misti, Reg. 32, fol. 121^v, published in Sime Ljubić, *Listine, in Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV [Zagreb, 1874], no. CLXV, pp. 92–93, who included the text among his documents because he mistakenly assumed it related to Scutari in Albania). Bragadin was to request Scutari "pro habitatione et reducto nostrorum mercatorum," but since the Senate wanted Murad I to fortify the place at his own expense and to grant the Venetians exemption from both import and export duties as well as a wide range of "franchisiae, avantagia, iurisdictiones ac libertates," very likely the Ottoman ruler quickly lost whatever interest he may have had in the proposal. Considering the nature of Bragadin's orders from the Senate, it is almost inconceivable that he did not do everything possible to secure Scutari for Venice.

¹⁰² Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, V (Quaracchi, 1927), 134, note 1.

¹⁰³ Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 35^v, dated 6 October, 1369: "Capta: Quia pro honore nostro et bono nostrorum mercatorum facit mittere ambaxiatam nostram ad dominum imperatorem Constantinopolitanum, qui est in partibus Rome, tum pro honorando excellentiam suam et congaudendo de adventu suo ad curiam romanam tum pro confirmatione treuguarum

ine the excitement of the Roman populace. No ruling emperor had come from Constantinople to Rome since the time of Constans II, seven centuries before, and now this emperor from the legendary East had come to humble himself before their bishop and to become a convert to Latin Catholicism.

The two important ceremonies which followed are alluded to in the *Secunda vita Urbani V* in Baluze's collection of the lives of the Avignonese popes:

. . . On 13 October the pope came to the city, where the lord emperor of the Greeks, John Palaeologus by name, was already awaiting him, and on S. Luke's day [18 October] in the hospital of S. Spirito . . . he made his profession [of faith] in the presence of five cardinals and two protonotaries, and swore that he would always keep it. Afterwards he signed it with his own hand in cinnabar ink, and with a gold seal he sealed the document, which was written in Greek and Latin, and he had it placed in the archives of the Church. Then, on Sunday, the twenty-first of the said month, the lord pope, coming out to the stairs of S. Peter's, received the emperor as he mounted the stairs to meet him, and going into the Church together, the pope celebrated mass in his presence.¹⁹⁴

Six centuries later this document, dated 18 October, 1369, with its gold seal still attached, is preserved in the Vatican Archives, together with a second chrysobull, another redaction of the imperial profession of faith prepared in January, 1370, to remove any conceivable ambiguity as to John's full conversion to Latin Catholicism.¹⁹⁵

habito respectu ad bonam voluntatem et dispositionem quam ipse dominus imperator ostendit habere erga nos, ut patet tam per litteras suas nobis missas quam per litteras domini patriarche Constantinopolitani [i.e. Pauli] . . . vadit pars quod mittantur in bona gratia duo solemnes ambaxiatores ad ipsum dominum imperatorem. . . ."

By action of the Senate on 14 June, 1369, Bragadin, who had just returned from Constantinople, "et est de negociis dictarum partium plenarie informatus," could be invited to sit in the Senate when Greek affairs were being discussed. He might express his opinion, but not being a member of the Senate, he could neither vote nor otherwise take part (*ibid.*, fol. 24^r). His advice was obviously sought on the embassy now being sent to the emperor.

¹⁹⁴ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I, 391, and *cf.* p. 372.

¹⁹⁵ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, A. A. Arm. I-XVIII, nos. 401, 395, and note *I Concili ecumenici nei documenti dell' Archivio Vaticano*, Città del Vaticano, 1964, pt. 2, nos. 60-61, pp. 44-45; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1369, nos. 1-3, and ad ann. 1370, no. 1, vol. VII (1752), pp. 171-73, 180. On the ceremonies in S. Spirito and at S. Peter's, see Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 195-99, and on John's second

The author of the *Prima vita Urbani* states that John had been received in Rome with "somewhat less" (*paulo minus*) formality than if he had been the western emperor, who took precedence at the Curia over all other princes.¹⁹⁶ Perhaps John and the Greeks in his entourage were not well enough acquainted with Roman curial etiquette to know the difference. His own conversion did not of course constitute the "union of the Churches," but the Curia regarded it as the most important first step in that direction.

On 4 November (1369), two weeks after the ceremony in S. Peter's, Urban wrote Amadeo of Savoy that the latter's cousin, the Emperor John, had publicly abjured the schism on 21 October "in the basilica of the prince of the apostles." He was therefore entitled to the repayment of the 20,000 florins [or less] which he had loaned Amadeo at Pera, and "which you promised to repay him within one month after he had appeared in our presence." Urban urged Amadeo to meet this obligation promptly to preserve his own honor and to relieve the emperor's indigence. He also informed Amadeo that he was writing to "some kings and other magnates" to send help now "to the emperor, a Catholic prince, to recover the imperial lands which the impious Turks have occupied." He exhorted Amadeo to send still further help to Byzantium, for no one knew better than the crusader count the "miserable state of the empire, which you saw with your own eyes only a little while ago."¹⁹⁷ On 13 November Urban issued an

chrysobull (that of January, 1370), *ibid.*, pp. 202-3; and *cf.* Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone*, pp. 146-48, 168, 438, and Setton, in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), pp. 46-47, with refs. The author of the *Prima vita Urbani V* also notes the consignment of this document to the papal archives: ". . . [imperator] certam bullam grece et latine conscripsit, et sua bulla aurea sigillavit, quam in archivis Ecclesie conservandam dicto pape assignavit" (Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 372).

¹⁹⁶ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, I, 372, and *cf.* Agostino Patrizzi and Johann Burchard, *Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive sacrarum ceremoniarum SS. Romanae Ecclesiae libri tres* . . . [= *Caeremoniale Romanum*], ed. Cristoforo Marcello, Venice, 1516, repr. 1965, fol. 20^r: "Quod autem de imperatore dicimus, intelligimus de imperatore Romanorum, non autem Graecorum, nam ille ut rex tractatur" (cited by Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae*, II, 555, and noted by Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, p. 194). In Rome the emperor was "treated like a king."

¹⁹⁷ Lecacheux and Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V*, I, fasc. 3, no. 2999, p. 518, and Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 200-1, and app. no. 14, pp. 378-79.

encyclical asking the Christian princes to aid the emperor, *verus . . . Ecclesiae filius*, and on 29 January (1370) he sent a special appeal to the same effect to Andrea Contarini, the doge of Venice, and to Gabriele Adorno, the doge of Genoa. The Church could rejoice, he told them, "when our dearest son in Christ, John Palaeologus, illustrious emperor of the Greeks, came to the holy Apostolic See in a spirit of devotion, abjured the schism completely, and professed the Catholic faith, which he now holds and the aforesaid Church teaches . . . , and we piously hope that even as long ago the conversion of the Emperor Constantine caused the conversion of innumerable peoples, just so (by the example and effort of the Emperor John) peoples without number, who now follow the schism and errors of the Greeks, will by divine grace return to the Lord's fold!" John should thus be cherished by the Christian powers, whose help he needed desperately to save the eastern empire, which the Turks had reduced almost to the point of extermination.¹⁹⁸

Although on instructions from the Senate Jacopo Bragadin had taken an intransigent attitude in dealing with John V on the proposed renewal of the Veneto-Byzantine treaty or truce (*treuguae*), the Senate finally saw that John had offered all he was able to give. His conversion had also gained him Urban V's energetic support. The new envoys whom the Senate sent to Rome about the end of October, Tommaso Sanudo and Marco Giustinian, were empowered to accept a compromise *per viam curialitatis* without giving up Venetian rights and claims in future confirmations of the truce.¹⁹⁹ The two envoys, nevertheless, tried to gain all they could, and it required prolonged negotiations to reach a settlement, but at long last the truce was agreed to on 1 February, 1370.

John recognized the right of the Venetians, according to imperial commitments in the past, to buy houses, lands, gardens, and other proper-

ties "in Constantinople and the empire," but the Venetian government was to prohibit their doing so during the five years' duration of the present truce. Such properties as were already in Venetian hands, however, were to be retained according to the conditions under which they were then held, and the emperor would not levy any additional taxes or charges on them. Since John claimed that he had lost much revenue on the many taverns which the Venetians then had in Constantinople, and on the large quantity of wine sold in them, the Venetians acceded to his request that they should not operate more than fifteen taverns in the city, and that all others should be closed, but this concession was not *ipso facto* to mean any abridgment of Venetian rights and franchises in the future. There was some regulation of the grain trade, and John undertook to make amends for all *novitates, extorsiones, iniuriae, offensae, et damna* which his government had caused citizens and subjects of the Republic since the last confirmation of the truce (in 1363).

The Venetians claimed that John had owed them 25,663 *hyperpyra* for damages and improper levies to which the imperial government had subjected them, and in this connection John acknowledged the Byzantine transgression of past agreements by complying with their request for payment. He had already given Bragadin 4,500, and he now bound himself to discharge the balance of 21,163 in annual installments of 4,212 *hyperpyra* plus 14 carats. The first payment was to be made on the following 1 January (1371), with subsequent payments to be made without fail on the same date in the four succeeding years. But these reimbursements for *damna* did not discharge, and were in no way related to, two previous loans which the Venetians had made the Byzantine government of 30,000 gold ducats (in the summer of 1343) and of 5,000 thereafter, for which loans the doge and commune of Venice held the "jewels of the empire" in surety, and John was not pressed in this truce to redeem the *iocalia imperii*, both because they had substantial value and because the envoys knew he lacked the means of doing so.

The text of the truce was prepared in both Greek and Latin, and signed in cinnabar ink by the Emperor John, who had his gold seal attached to the document. Its various provisions were put into effect and witnessed "in the hostelry of [Ran]nuccio Massarocca, in the region of Regola, in which we are at present

¹⁹⁸ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1369, nos. 4-5, vol. VII (1752), p. 173.

¹⁹⁹ Misti, Reg. 33, fols. 36^r, 37-38, on which see Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 422 ff. On 29 October, 1369, Sanudo and Giustinian received their final instructions: "Quia non est honor noster movere litigia in damnum franchisiarum et immunitatum nostrarum, vadit pars quod committatur dictis nostris ambaxiatoribus quod procurent confirmare treugas cum domino imperatore super omnibus aliis differentiis cum maiori prerogativa libertatum et honoris nostri quam melius fieri poterint" (Reg. cit., fol. 38^r).

lodged."²⁰⁰ The emperor was thus living in the district where in October, 1367, Amadeo of Savoy had visited the churches of S. Anastasio and S. Paolo alla Regola, the busy seventh region, which was probably as fashionable an area as the rundown state of fourteenth-century Rome provided. Although John might perhaps have stayed in, say, the fortified Orsini palace on Monte Giordano (where I think it likely that Amadeo stayed),²⁰¹ the Curia doubtless considered it better that he avoid residence with a Roman family and thus keep clear of any involvement in the factional strife which constantly beset the city.

Whatever his religious convictions, John V had gone to Rome to secure further armed assistance against the Turks and to meet the terms required for the repayment of the 20,000 florins [or less] which he had been obliged to loan Amadeo of Savoy at Pera. A week or more before John left Rome, Pope Urban addressed a letter (dated 22 February, 1370) to all the clergy, of every rank and title, throughout "Greece," expressing joy in John's return to the "maternal bosom" of the Roman Church and once more comparing his conversion to that of Constantine the Great. But Urban acknowledged that the Church would certainly have a greater reason for rejoicing if the Byzantine clergy everywhere would now follow the imperial example and also return "to the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, outside which there is no salvation." Imploring them to come back into the fold under the pastoral staff of Christ's own vicar, Urban exclaimed, "O that God had granted so great a grace in our day that we should see the union of the eastern and western Churches, torn from each other, alas, for so long a time!" Again he held out to the Greeks the hope of Latin

aid against the Turks if they would follow the imperial lead and come back into the fold.²⁰²

Apparently John did get a little military help at this time, which probably cost him a good part of the 20,000 florins [or less] which we assume that Amadeo repaid as promptly as he could. Always anxious to rid Italy of the *routiers* and send them off to fight the Turks, Urban encouraged John to enroll some of these freebooters in Byzantine service. On 27 February (1370), five days after his general exhortation to the Greek clergy, Urban wrote Joanna I of Naples and Philip of Taranto, *imperator Constantinopolitanus*, asking them to allow free passage through their domains (Philip was also prince of Achaëa) to the "men-at-arms of diverse nations" whom the Emperor John would soon be leading or sending overseas against the Turks. Joanna and Philip were asked to provide these *gentes armigeræ* with food, transport, and other necessities at the expense of the latter,²⁰³ which must mean that either the pope or the emperor had contrived to pay some of their wages in advance.

After more than five months' residence in Rome, John departed for Naples in early March, 1370 "with the four galleys with which he had come."²⁰⁴ He reached Naples after a leisurely trip down the coast, and was again lodged in the Castelnuovo. His flotilla then rounded the Italian peninsula, sailed up the Adriatic, stopped for a while at Ancona, and then went on to Venice, where he hoped to find money and transport for troops to be sent against the Turks. He seems to have arrived in May, and rather unexpectedly perhaps spent more than ten months on the lagoon; the wintry season past, he left at the beginning of April (1371), probably put into Thessalonica for some time, and got back to Constantinople on 28 October.²⁰⁵ The extreme financial embarrassment which John suffered during his long stay in Venice is well known, and has been the subject of scholarly controversy.

According to the later fifteenth-century

²⁰⁰ G. M. Thomas and R. Predelli, eds., *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II (Venice, 1899, repr. New York, 1965), doc. 89, pp. 151–56: "Que omnia suprascripta acta sunt in Roma, in hospicio Nucii Massaroch in regione Regule, in quo nunc ad presens hospitamur. . . ." The "region of Regola" was the seventh *rione* in Rome; it extended along the left bank of the Tiber (for its boundaries, cf. Umberto Gnoli, *Topografia e toponomastica di Roma medioevale e moderna*, Rome, 1939, p. 263). Originally called Arenula (from the *rena* or sand of the riverbank), the name was corrupted into Regola. The Via Arenula, on which the emperor's hostelry probably stood, was a busy street in the fourteenth century; it corresponded to the present Via di Monserrato (with the extensions on either end), and at no point coincided with the Via Arenula of today (Gnoli, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 257).

²⁰¹ Cf. Barbier's accounts, nos. 1049–50.

²⁰² Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1370, nos. 2–3, vol. VII (1752), pp. 180–81, but the pope still declined to accept the proposal for a *synodus Latinorum et Graecorum* (*ibid.*, and Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, p. 205).

²⁰³ Lecacheux and Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 3, nos. 3040–41, p. 525, and cf. Halecki, pp. 215–17.

²⁰⁴ Baluze and Mollat, *Vitæ*, I, 392.

²⁰⁵ Loenertz, *Les Recueils de lettres de Démétrius Cydonès* (1947), p. 112.

historian Laonicus Chalcocondylas, John was detained by the Venetian government (κατεσχέθη τε αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἑνετῶν) until he could pay what he owed his creditors (δανεισταί). He sent off for money to his son Andronicus [IV], whom he had left as regent in Constantinople, directing him to collect and transmit the necessary funds to Venice by selling ecclesiastical and other available treasures (κειμήλια) and not to let him waste a long time in virtual imprisonment (καὶ μὴ περιδεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ ὄντα πάνυ πολὺν διατρίβειν χρόνον). Andronicus, however, who was enjoying the exercise of imperial power and had small love for his father, made no effort to do as he was bid, and sent back word that their compatriots would not permit him to use the treasures of the Byzantine Church in this way, and that he was unable to raise from other sources the sums John said he required. He suggested that his father look elsewhere for the wherewithal he needed to discharge his debts and thus regain his freedom. But John's younger son Manuel [II], learning of his father's difficulties, promptly raised a large sum of money, hastily boarded a ship for Venice, where he offered himself as a pawn in the game the Venetians were allegedly playing, and soon rescued John from his predicament. Manuel's filial loyalty endeared him to John, who was naturally embittered by Andronicus's faithless conduct, which caused the enmity between John and Andronicus that persisted until the latter's death (in June, 1385).²⁰⁶

²⁰⁶ Laonicus Chalcocondylas, *Hist.*, I (Bonn, pp. 50–51, and ed. E. Darkó, 2 vols., Budapest, 1922–27, I, 46–47), whose account was adapted by the Pseudo-Sphrantzes ("Phrantzes"), *Chronicon maius*, I, 12 (Bonn, pp. 52–54). The work of "Phrantzes" (actually that of the late sixteenth-century forger Macarius Melissenus) does not confirm the account of Chalcocondylas; it merely follows it, and can no longer be used as an independent source for John V's so-called detention in Venice. The proper form of the name is Sphrantzes, as V. Laurent made clear years ago (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLIV [1951], 373–78, and *Revue des études byzantines*, IX [1952], 170–71, and see D. A. Zakythinos, "Σφραντζῆς ὁ Φιαλίτης," in the *Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, XXIII [1953], 657–59). George Sphrantzes' own memoirs, known as the *Chronicon minus* (in PG 156, cols. 1025–80), cover the period from 1401 to 1477, and they contain no mention of John V's voyage to Italy and detention in Venice. There is extant part of a synodal decree prohibiting the alienation of church possessions, which may well date from 1370 (Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca: Acta patriarchatus constantinopolitani*, I [1860, repr. 1968], no. CCLXI, pp. 513–14), and if so, it might confirm at least some of Chalcocondylas's account.

Since we shall have to return to "Phrantzes" and Sphrantzes in our second volume, some word concerning the

There can be no doubt that John had fallen into a financial quagmire. The "stingy" merchants of Venice would not lend him any more ducats, and his return was going to cost a pretty penny, for he was presumably still maintaining his four galleys. The preamble to one of his

Chronica minus et maius may not be out of place here. The older bibliography is conveniently assembled in Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1958, I, 287–88, but particular attention should be called to R. J. Loenertz, "Autour du Chronicon maius attribué à Georges Phrantzès," in the *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, III (Città del Vaticano, 1946), 273–311 (*Studi e testi*, no. 123), reprinted in *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca* (1970), pp. 3–44, esp. pp. 23–24 (*Storia e letteratura*, no. 118). Mention should also be made of V. Grecu's articles on "Das Memoirenwerk des Georgios Sphrantzes," in the *Actes du XII^e Congrès international des études byzantines* [1961], II (Belgrade, 1964), 327–41, and "Georgios Sphrantzes," *Byzantinoslavica*, XXVI (1965), 62–73, as well as his excellent edition of both Sphrantzes' "Memoirs" (the *Chronicon minus*) and the "Pseudo-Phrantzes = Macarius Melissenus" *Chronicle*, with Rumanian translations of both texts (Bucharest, 1966).

J. K. Casiotes has also discussed the career of Macarius in a most interesting monograph on *Makarios, Theodoros and Nikephoros, the Melissenoi (Melissourgoi), 16th and 17th Centuries* [in Greek], Thessaloniki, 1966, where Macarius's forgery of the Sphrantzes-Chronicle is also discussed (esp. pp. 171–77). Macarius's true name and that of his brother Theodore and the latter's son Nicephorus was actually Melissurgus. They adopted the more eminent name Melissenus, although Macarius commonly identified himself merely as the "metropolitan of Monemvasia," while Nicephorus even added the name Comnenus to that of Melissenus! (*ibid.*, pp. 18–22, 66–67, 179).

In 1570 Macarius is to be found in the Morea, where he and his brother Theodore were apparently in contact with the Spanish even before the battle of Lepanto (7 October, 1571). Placing high hopes in the Holy League of the time, they helped promote the uprising against the Turks in 1571–1572, as Don John of Austria wrote his half-brother Philip II of Spain from his command post at Naples on 20 May, 1573 (Casiotes, *op. cit.*, doc. III, pp. 187–89, gives the text of the letter). The brothers Melissurgi fled from the Morea at the beginning of 1573. They were on the island of Corfu in February, and in Venice in March; they reached Rome in early April, and toward the end of the same month they arrived in Naples, where Don John wrote Philip on their behalf. Shortly afterwards they went to Spain, where they spent a year or more (1573–1574). Macarius was back in Venice in March, 1575, and the brothers finally settled in Naples, where they became very influential in the Greek community, and where they both died, Theodore on 25 March, 1582, and Macarius on 12 September, 1585 (*ibid.*, pp. 28–60, 66–67). Macarius seems to have produced the Sphrantzes forgery in Naples during the years 1575–1577. Margaret Carroll, "Notes on the Authorship of the 'Siege' Section of the Chronicon Maius of Pseudo-Phrantzes, Book III," *Byzantion*, XLI (1971), 28–44, has tried to show that in his account of the Turkish siege and capture of Constantinople in 1453, Macarius used Sphrantzes' own expanded version of his memoirs, and it is precisely to this vexed question that we shall come in Volume II.

chrysobulls alludes to the fact that the longer he remained on the lagoon, the worse his plight became; eventually he would leave his son Manuel behind as "surety" to effect the clearance of some of his debts.²⁰⁷ But while John was immobilized by lack of funds (with his daily expenses continuing), he certainly was not "arrested" by the state at the instance of his creditors, as the account in Chalcocondylas suggests, and as some modern historians would have us believe.²⁰⁸

To assume that John had sailed the length of the Adriatic on the off chance that the Venetians would hearken to Urban V's appeal to the Signoria and allow him to add large sums to those he already owed them, is to belittle his intelligence. When it was clear that his hosts would furnish him with no more money without a *quid pro quo*, he informed the Signoria (about the beginning of July, 1370) that he wished to take up with them "some matters of importance," and according to the chronicler Gian Giacomo Caroldo, a committee of five was chosen to hear his proposals, among them Jacopo Bragadin, who had been the Republic's envoy to Constantinople in 1368–1369. John apparently stated that he was now ready to cede the island

of Tenedos, which Venice had long coveted as a counterweight to the Genoese possession of Pera. As Caroldo says, the matter of Tenedos was discussed at length (*et fo trattata la materia de Tenedo*). The Venetian negotiators suggested that, in exchange for the island, John accept a threefold payment comprising (1) the return of the imperial jewels which the procurators of S. Mark had held for almost thirty years as security for debt, (2) six transports, which John would have to arm at his own expense, and (3) the sum of 25,000 ducats, of which he obviously needed some portion immediately for his current expenses. The Signoria is said to have advanced him 4,000 ducats which he requested "for his living expenses" (*per il viver suo*), although a brief, tantalizing entry in the *Misti* shows that by 21 July John had not yet accepted the offer. At this point a marginal note in Caroldo adds that "his imperial Majesty, on the surety of some of his jewels, requested 30,000 ducats, which were paid to him, having been taken on loan from the 'Camera del Formento' [the 'Grain Bank'], i.e. from diverse persons who deposited such funds in the said Camera. And it was made clear that, when the emperor handed over Tenedos, he should not pay the interest [*il pro*], except for three years, and that he might have the jewels."²⁰⁹

Caroldo's text has often been cited to show that in the winter of 1370–1371 John V requested and obtained from the Venetians another loan of 30,000 ducats on another set of jewels. In this connection Loenertz once suggested that the money (*χρήματα*) which Chalcocondylas says Manuel raised in the region of Thessalonica, and brought to his father on the lagoon, was actually in the form of jewels (*κημεῖλια*), church vessels, and other such objects of value, which served as collateral for the second loan. Caroldo, who wrote at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was in error, however, for the documents published by Bertelè a dozen years ago show that there was only one set of jewels and only one loan for 30,000 ducats, and that John had received the money twenty-seven years before.²¹⁰ The documents reveal no discussion of the sale of Tenedos at the time.

²⁰⁷ Zachariae von Lingenthal, "Prooemien zu Chrysobullen von Demetrius Cydones," *Sitzungsberichte d. Königlich Preussischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1888, pt. 2, pp. 1414–15, 1420: ἐγγυητὴς δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ δαπάνης ἐσόμενος, ἦν ἡμῖν πῶς ἔχουσεν ἡ τῶν ἐμπόρων μικρολογία. This preamble (*προοίμιον*) was probably written by Cydones. The chrysobull confers the newly won province and revenues of Macedonia on Manuel, the despot of Thessalonica, who entered Serres (*Εραι, Serrhai*) in November, 1371, after the Turks had crushed the Serbs in the battle on the Maritsa (P.N. Papageorgiou, "Serres . . . and the Monastery of St. John the Baptist" [in Greek], *Byz. Zeitschr.*, III [1894], 316, note 2, from MS. 21 of the Protaton at Karyes on Mount Athos; Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 247–48; Loenertz, *Les Recueils de lettres de Démétrius Cydonès*, p. 112).

²⁰⁸ Franz Dölger, "Johannes VII., Kaiser der Rhomaer, 1390–1408," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXXI (1931), 22–23, note 2; *ibid.*, XXXIII (1933), 134–35 (a review of Halecki's *Un Empereur de Byzance*); *ibid.*, XLIII (1950), 441; Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (1956), pp. 480–81; and cf. Peter Charanis, "The Strife among the Palaeologi and the Ottoman Turks, 1370–1402," *Byzantion*, XVI (1942–43), 287–92, who is more cautious. These writers oppose the contention of Halecki, *op. cit.*, pp. 227 ff. and esp. pp. 334–43, and "Two Palaeologi in Venice, 1370–1371," *Byzantion*, XVII (1944–45), 331–35, that John V's detention for debt at Venice is a myth (see below), which has its origin in the chrysobull published by Zachariae. See the valuable but over-subtle rationalization of the sources by R. J. Loenertz, "Jean V Paléologue à Venise (1370–1371)," in the *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI (1958), 217–32.

²⁰⁹ For the text of Caroldo, see Loenertz, *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI, 228–29, which is based upon the autograph MS. of book X of the chronicle (in Venice in the Bibl. Nazionale Marciana, MS. Ital., Cl. VII, no. 803 [7295], fol. 19^r [37^r] and ff.).

²¹⁰ Loenertz, *op. cit.*, pp. 218–19, 222–23, but on the

John V's embarrassing indebtedness to Venice went back to July, 1343, when he was eleven years old, at which time his empress mother Anna of Savoy borrowed 30,000 ducats from Venice. Anna and John were supposed to repay the loan in three years (in 1346), with interest at 5 per cent per annum (*in ratione quinque pro C. in anno*). Anna had pledged precious stones, pearls, and gold as surety to the Republic, on whose behalf nine Venetian merchants in Constantinople had advanced the funds. Venice was to receive 10,000 ducats a year *cum prode* (plus the interest) from the Byzantine customs duties collected on the Bosphorus. The procurators of S. Mark were given custody of the imperial "jewels." On 1 December, 1343, the Senate had voted to borrow 30,000 ducats (needed to repay the nine merchants) from the "Camera Frumenti," in which both citizens and foreigners, *tam cives quam forenses*, deposited money for the interest paid by the Camera.

A decade later, in October, 1352, John V had borrowed another 5,000 ducats. These were the years of struggle with John VI Cantacuzenus. This time he gave in pledge a ruby, which was also turned over to the procurators of S. Mark (in December, 1352). These loans had not been repaid (indeed they would never be repaid), and the interest was mounting. Apparently John V regarded himself as bound to the payment of interest for the stipulated period of three years (1344, 1345, and 1346), within which he should have acquitted himself of the debt, but the Venetians insisted upon being repaid not only the principal but also compound interest through the full period of the loan's duration, *ad habendum tam capitale quam prode, quam etiam prode prodis*, according to the senatorial deliberation of 15 July, 1350. They wanted the "interest on the interest." Thirteen years later (on 27 June, 1363) the Senate directed the bailie in Constantinople and his councillors that, if the emperor claimed that he was only responsible for the "principal and interest for the said [first] three years" (*capitale . . . et prode dictorum trium annorum*), which amounted to 34,500 ducats, they should propose to him arbitration of the amount by some third party (*aliquis princeps vel dominus*

whole question of the loan which the emperor obtained from Venice and the jewels which he and his mother turned over to the Signoria as collateral, see the thorough study of Tommaso Bertelè, "I Gioielli della corona bizantina dati in pegno alla repubblica veneta nel sec. XIV e Mastino II della Scala," in *Studi in onore di Amintore Fanfani*, II (1962), 89–177, with thirty-six documents.

mundi). At compound interest, by 1 January, 1364, the imperial debt had reached the considerable sum of 79,598 ducats, 22 *grossi*, and 7 *piccoli*.

Even at simple interest it had become no less than 67,500 ducats at the end of twenty-five years (1343–1368), at which time, on 21 April, 1368, it was noted in the Senate that the loan still remained unpaid although *pluries et pluries* Venetian ambassadors, bailies, and councillors had pressed the emperor for payment. Upon instructions from the Senate they had even threatened John with the sale of his "crown jewels" at public auction, which they did (as we have seen) on 23 February, 1369, when they still insisted upon payment of both principal and interest "from the time the loan was made up to now" (*a tempore mutui facti usque nunc*). Faced with a debt of tens of thousands of ducats, his precious collection of jewels in the locked closets of S. Mark's, and in desperate need of money for defense against the Turks, John was ready to discuss the sale of Tenedos.

After what we may assume was a good deal of haggling, the Venetians offered John (according to Caroldo), in exchange for Tenedos, the return of his jewels, six transports, and a settlement of 25,000 ducats. The only entry in the Misti relating to these matters between 23 February, 1369, and 21 June, 1373, comes in the midst of John's negotiations with Venice. It is dated 21 July, 1370, and reads as follows: "Resolved: That this 25,000 ducats and what is expended for the preparation of the horse transports, if the lord emperor accepts [our offer], be received on loan from the Camera Frumenti at the usual interest. . . ." ²¹¹ No vote is recorded. The cross

²¹¹ Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 66v: "Capta: Quod ista XXV m. ducatorum et id quod expendetur pro conzamento usseriorum, si dominus Imperator acceptabit, accipiantur mutuo a Camera Frumenti ad prode solitum. . . ." See Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 228–29, and cf. p. 342, who gives this text (with misreadings) from the Misti, as well as a deficient text of Caroldo in his app. no. 21, pp. 385–86. The interpretation of events as given by Loenertz, *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI, 221–23, 229–30, requires rectification in the light of the documents published by Bertelè, "I Gioielli," *Studi in onore di A. Fanfani*, II, esp. nos. 1–4, 6–7, 10, 13–15, 18–20, 28–30, and 33–36, which illustrate the history of the imperial debt from 1343 to 1389, and from which the data in my text are drawn. See also Julian Chrysostomides, "John V Palaeologus in Venice (1370–1371) and the Chronicle of Caroldo: A Reinterpretation," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXXI (1965), 76–84. Freddy Thiriet, "Venise et l'occupation de Ténédos au XIV^e siècle," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXV (1953), 224–25, says that the Signoria broached the subject of Tenedos—

in the left-hand margin of the register, however, bears witness to the Senate's passage of the resolution. But John did not give up Tenedos; he never got his jewels back; and six years later the Venetians were to take the island by force, as we shall see, when John's rebellious son Andronicus IV tried to give it to the Genoese.

In the meantime no island for Venice meant no jewels and no money for John. The negotiations had proved unsatisfactory to the Greeks. A letter of Demetrius Cydones expresses the discouragement which existed in the emperor's entourage. Cydones, who had accompanied John to Rome and thence to Venice, wrote his friend Constantine Asanes toward the end of the year 1370. Asanes had also gone to Rome, but had left the emperor and his companions when they had reached Ancona, to try to raise money in the Peloponnesus to assist the imperial party's return home. Cydones informed Asanes of the grand reception and applause which the emperor had received upon his entry into Venice, but he indicated that now it was all ending in futility. They had hastened to Venice, hoping to be shown the riches of Croesus. It was apparent, however, that all they were going to see was charcoal. The emperor and his retinue still did not have money enough to return to the Bosphorus.²¹²

John's reluctance to accept the Venetian offer is clear. The reasons for his reluctance are not. Very likely, as Loenertz has suggested, Andronicus IV and (what is more) the Genoese had objected to the cession of Tenedos to Venice. John's Genoese brother-in-law Francesco I Gattilusio of Mytilene had gone with him to Rome, and was probably well aware of his intention to discuss the sale of the island. Caroldo states "that, when the emperor handed over Tenedos, he should not pay the interest, except for three years [1344–1346], and that he might have the jewels."

Although the Venetians were thus at long last willing to forgive John the accumulated interest for the years 1347–1370 (=36,000 ducats), they were nevertheless insisting upon interest for the three years of the original contract (=4,500 ducats). It can be plausibly argued that, if the Venetians wanted payment of the three years'

interest, *a fortiori* they must also have required repayment of the emperor's initial indebtedness (=30,000 ducats). If this were so, John would receive 25,000 ducats, but would still have to pay 34,500 to get back his jewels, in which case how could the Venetians have possibly expected him to raise the balance of 9,500? On the other hand, the Senate was clearly prepared to give John 25,000 ducats in cash when on 21 July, 1370, the resolution was passed authorizing a second loan on his behalf from the Camera del Formento. By 1370 certainly no one in the Senate believed that John could ever repay either simple or compound interest for the whole period of the debt. Why not remit it? As a matter of business practice and precedent, however, it was apparently deemed desirable to insist upon the feasible payment of the first three years' interest, which John could easily pay the Signoria when the Senate had arranged for the new loan from the Camera.

The proposed return of John's jewels suggests, moreover, that the Senate had also become reconciled to cancelling the principal, for which the jewels were being held. Cancellation of the principal would entail the return of the jewels. It would in fact seem that the Venetians were prepared to pay 55,000 ducats for the island of Tenedos²¹³—the 25,000 mentioned by Caroldo and voted by the Senate on 21 July, 1370, plus the 30,000 of the original loan. They were also willing to furnish him with the hulls of six old transports, which could soon be readied for service in the Arsenal. John probably wanted the transports to carry some of the *routiers*, "men-at-arms of diverse nations," with their horses and gear, whom Urban V had helped him raise in central and southern Italy.

Why, then, did John not sell Tenedos to Venice? Was it the price? John would have had to acknowledge that, with the return of his jewels, the Venetians had offered him 55,000 ducats. The Venetian view was that, with the remission of all interest after 1347 (for which

and the two Venetian envoys sent to Rome for the renewal of the quinquennial truce very likely did bring the matter up—but Caroldo leaves the initiative in Venice to John V.

²¹² Loenertz, *Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance*, I (1956), bk. VII, ep. 71, pp. 102–3, and *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI, 217–18.

²¹³ It has been pointed out by J. Chrysostomides, *Orient. Christ. period.*, XXXI, 79–80, note 5, that in 1350 Venice offered the Angevins only 50,000 ducats for the islands of Corfu, Zante, and Cephalonia (Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 249, p. 71), and that in 1404 the Hospitallers returned the castellany of Corinth and the despotate of the Morea to the Byzantines for 46,500 ducats (Loenertz, "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," in the *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II [Studi e testi, no. 232; Città del Vaticano, 1964], 426–27). In neither case, however, were large, irrecoverable debts involved.

John apparently disclaimed responsibility), they were offering him close to 100,000. What was the obstacle? We do not know, but to quote Caroldo again: "His said Majesty spent all that winter in Italy. And he finally gave [the Venetians] to understand, through his son the despot [Manuel, who had joined him in Venice], that for diverse reasons the cession of Tenedos could not take effect."²¹⁴

Manuel had arrived on the lagoon in mid-winter. He probably shared in the final decision not to sell the island, and may have told his father: I have brought you money enough to get home, and I fear the reaction of the Genoese to this proposal. There is no way of knowing what he said, but the revised text of Caroldo indicates that it was Manuel himself who informed the Signoria that Tenedos could not be sold to the Republic. He may have added that the matter could be reconsidered at a later date. Indeed, he probably did so, for a spirit of amity seems to have prevailed during the last weeks of the emperor's sojourn in the city.

John stayed on in Venice, for he did not relish a wintry voyage around Cape Matapan. With the approach of spring and good weather, however, he began to prepare for his return to Constantinople, "and in order that his Majesty might have reason to leave well satisfied," continues Caroldo, "on 2 March, 1371 [about a month before his departure], it was decreed that the 4,000 ducats which had been loaned to him as part of the 25,000 ducats which were to be paid him for Tenedos, which [transaction] had not taken effect, should be generously given to him. . . ." The Venetians also gave him 400 measures of ship's biscuit for his crews, and made Manuel a gift of 300 ducats.²¹⁵ Hardly more than two years later, when in June, 1373, the convoy of merchant galleys (the *muda*) was being formed for Greece, Tana, and Trebizond, the Senate voted "that the jewels of the lord emperor of Constantinople can [now] be sent to Constantinople with the galleys on the voyage to Romania without charge for conveyance, and on this condition the aforesaid galleys may be loaded." There were two neutral ballots, and only four dissenting votes.²¹⁶ It is hard to escape

the conclusion that John was reconciled to the eventual cession of Tenedos, but the jewels were not sent. Indeed, they remained in Venetian custody until after the fall of Constantinople eighty years later.

Much remains obscure, but if Caroldo's account is at all accurate, and it has confirmation in the senatorial resolutions of 21 July, 1370, and 21 June, 1373, John might have felt some slight satisfaction when he set sail for home in the early spring of 1371. The Venetians were apparently willing to cancel his debt and return the crown jewels as soon as they could acquire Tenedos, which he was in no position to defend. After an assumed stop at Thessalonica, as we have noted, he arrived back in Constantinople on 28 October, to face a multiplicity of problems that he would never solve. Although he remained faithful to the religious commitment he had made at Rome, he never tried to effect the union of the Churches. Since the Holy See refused to take part in an oecumenical council, the Patriarch Philotheus declined to communicate with the Curia, and strove untiringly to bind the Orthodox Churches of the Levant, the Balkans, and Russia more closely to the patriarchal see of Constantinople.²¹⁷

While the Byzantine government stood aside, possibly because of the emperor's absence, the Turks inflicted a crushing defeat on the Serbs in the battle at Černomen on the Maritsa (on 26 September, 1371), which sounded the death knell of Serbian independence. In an illusion of Byzantine expansion the young Manuel, despot of Thessalonica, seized the chance to occupy southeastern Macedonia in November, but John V's shaky empire now seemed likely to survive only so long as the sufferance of the Turks would allow. After Černomen one half the lands belonging to the monks of Mount Athos and Thessalonica were converted into *pronoiai* in an effort to find some economic basis for the support of the dwindling military forces of the empire.²¹⁸

It was hard to find soldiers, however, and such measures were of little avail. The remaining twenty years of John V's reign were a continuing catastrophe. The imperial family was rent with internecine strife, and the imperial govern-

²¹⁴ For Loenertz's revision of this passage in Caroldo, see Chrysostomides, "John V," in *Orient. Christ. period.*, XXXI, 77-78.

²¹⁵ Caroldo, ed. Loenertz, *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI, 229.

²¹⁶ Misti, Reg. 34, fols. 55^v, 56^v, dated 21 June, 1373, published in Bertelè, "I Gioielli," doc. no. 32, p. 176. The

convoy was to consist of four of the better galleys used the preceding year.

²¹⁷ Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 236 ff.

²¹⁸ Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'Histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (1954), pp. 161-63 and ff.

ment declined into chaos. John faced three revolts (in 1373, 1376, and 1385) against his authority by his son Andronicus, whom he tried to remove from succession to the throne in favor of the faithful Manuel. But Andronicus's determination to rule on the Bosphorus would come to an end only with his death (in 1385), after which his son John [VII] would continue the struggle, and even make himself emperor for five months in 1390. When the weary John V finally died in 1391, however, Manuel managed to secure the dangerous crown.

After John V's return home from Venice, his relations with the Signoria were generally good, although harsh words would be exchanged when it came time to renew the quinquennial truce.²¹⁹ The Senate had voted to return his jewels in June, 1373, which was not done, presumably for the same "diverse reasons" that had prevented the sale of Tenedos two and a half years before. There were various problems to be dealt with in the event of the transfer of the island to Venice quite apart from the price and the opposition of the Genoese. It was agreed, for example, according to a doubtful (and in part apparently inaccurate) text of Caroldo that the Tenedians should have their own archbishop, their priests should be consecrated by the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, and the standard of the double-headed eagle should be raised along with the lion banner of S. Mark.²²⁰ John's contemplated sale of the strategic island of Tenedos, the "key to the Dardanelles," had excited the hostility of the Genoese, who aided Andronicus to escape from the confinement in which his father had placed him, and supported his second bid for the throne in the summer of 1376. For a while Andronicus's efforts were crowned with success; with the aid of the Turks as well as of the Genoese, he seized Constantinople after a month-long siege, and now imprisoned both his father and his brother Manuel. By a chrysobull

of 23 August (1376) he bestowed the "insulla Tenedi cum castro" upon the Genoese because, as he put it, of the love they bore him and the aid they had given him.²²¹ Inevitably war broke out between the two maritime states, for in October, 1376, the Venetians occupied Tenedos.²²² Some weeks later, in payment for the Turkish support he had received, Andronicus surrendered Gallipoli to Murad,²²³ thus undoing the major achievement of the Savoyard crusade.

John V and Manuel somehow regained their freedom, escaping from their prison in the tower of Anemas, and fled to Murad's court in Asia Minor. In July, 1379, they made a victorious re-entry into Constantinople with the aid of Turkish troopers, and in early August Venetian sailors helped them to reduce the Genoese garrison which Andronicus had left behind in the fortress when he fled back to Pera. But by April, 1381, the Genoese made peace with John V's Turkish allies, and John accepted a treaty with Andronicus and the latter's son, recognizing their rights of succession. Another treaty of November, 1382, between the Palaeologi, negotiated and guaranteed by the Genoese, confirmed the provisions of the earlier (non-extant) agreement. It is conceivable that Manuel and his father were getting along less well than formerly, for Manuel's imperial claims (he had become co-emperor in September, 1373) were disregarded in both these treaties. Despite John V's restoration to the throne, Andronicus and his son John VII retained the northern shore of the Marmara, with the fortified cities of Selymbria, Heraclea, Rhaedestus, and Panidus. After a sojourn among the Turks and a brief stay in Constantinople, Manuel succeeded in returning to Thessalonica, where he continued to call himself emperor, and where he ruled for five years (1382–1387), during most of which time his erstwhile friends, the Turks, had the capital of his "empire" under siege

²¹⁹ Cf. Misti, Reg. 38, fol. 94^r, dated 20 January, 1384 (Ven. style 1383); Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium*, II, nos. 115, 117, pp. 192–93, 196–97; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III (1883), bk. VIII, nos. 168, 187, pp. 166, 171. The truce was renewed between John V and Venice in June, 1390 (*Dipl.*, II, no. 135, pp. 224–29; *Regesti*, III, bk. VIII, no. 347, pp. 207–8; with the Greek text in Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca*, III [1865, repr. 1968], no. xxxiii, pp. 135–44), which was however during the period of John VII's usurpation.

²²⁰ Caroldo, ed. Loenertz, *Revue des études byzantines*, XVI, app. 1, p. 230. This text does not appear in Caroldo's autograph.

²²¹ *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, II (Turin, 1857), doc. CCL, cols. 819–21 (*Historiae patriae monumenta*, IX).

²²² Thiriet, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXV, 226–27, and Loenertz, "Notes d'histoire et de chronologie byzantines," *Revue des études byzantines*, XVII (1959), 166–67.

²²³ Loenertz, *Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance*, II (1960), bk. xviii, ep. 167, pp. 37–38, a letter to John Lascaris Calophorus, which Loenertz dates in the winter of 1376–1377, by which time the Turks had reoccupied Gallipoli and the Venetians, Tenedos. Cf. Charanis, in *Byzantion*, XVI, 297–98; Loenertz, *Recueils de lettres de Démétrius Cydonès*, p. 114; Dennis, *Reign of Manuel II* (1960), pp. 37–40, with a full display of the sources.

(and in fact took the city in April, 1387). Another brother, Theodore I, was named despot of the Morea (probably in the early spring of 1381), and toward the end of the following year he left the Bosphorus for the great walls and high fortress of Mistra. In the spring of 1385 Andronicus made war upon his hapless father for the third time, and at his death (on 28 June) he bequeathed Selymbria, his imperial claims, and his hatred for the old emperor to John VII, whom the Genoese would assist to make as much trouble as possible. The Palaeologi had helped to destroy their own empire, and the Turks gained enormously both from the strife within the ruling family and from the war between Venice and Genoa (1378–1381) over possession of the island of Tenedos.²²⁴

In the bitter struggle with Venice the Genoese were joined by the Carraresi of Padua. The Genoese occupied Chioggia, and began a blockade of the lagoon. The Hungarians invaded the Marca Trivigiana, and laid siege to the city of Treviso. But after the occupation of Chioggia, Francesco da Carrara quarreled with the Genoese commander over the booty, and Venice later gave up the Marca to the Austrians to help stem Carrarese ambition. At length, owing to Genoese errors and Venetian enterprise, the tables were turned at Chioggia; the Genoese besiegers became bottled up in the town, and they themselves became the besieged (in January, 1380); and finally their severely mauled and starving forces surrendered (in late June, 1381). We must pass over details of the complicated struggle which also involved the Veneto-Genoese rivalry in the Cypriote port of Famagusta. The war dragged on through the summer, but the intervention of Amadeo VI of Savoy brought it to an end in the peace of Turin. Before the hour of vespers on Thursday, 8 August, 1381, a large assembly of envoys and nobles, ecclesiastics and doctors of law gathered in the great hall of the castle of Turin, where Amadeo was then living. Among the nobles were several who had accompanied Amadeo on the crusade; the envoys included representatives of Hungary, Genoa, Padua, Venice, and the patriarchate of Aquileia.

Lamenting the *multipharia nephanda crimina* of the recent war, the text of the treaty extols

Amadeo as the promoter of peace and the athlete of Christendom. The Hungarian envoys saw to the interests of Louis the Great (d. 10 September, 1382), who was confirmed in his possession of Dalmatia (which he had got in the peace of Zara in 1358), and who was now to receive an annual tribute of 7,000 ducats from Venice. Further settlement was sought of Veneto-Hungarian disputes and differences as well as of the numerous Venetian grievances against the Carraresi. There was to be a general release of prisoners, including the miserable remnants of the Genoese armada which had surrendered at Chioggia. Of larger concern to us in the present context, the Venetians were to hand over to Amadeo or his lieutenant the island of Tenedos with all its fortifications within two and one-half months, and Amadeo was to hold the island at the common expense of Venice and Genoa. The Tenedian contest between the two maritime states was to be ended by the callous destruction and depopulation of the island. The text of the treaty thus provided

that all the castles, buildings, forts, houses, and habitations whatsoever on the said island—[all these], whenever it shall please the . . . lord doge and commune of Genoa, the lord of Savoy himself is required to have totally destroyed and demolished from top to bottom, but at the expense of the said commune of Genoa, in such fashion that the place can never be either rebuilt or reinhabited again.

The Venetians promised to put up, as a pledge for their free surrender of Tenedos to Amadeo, the sum of 150,000 florins or jewels of equal value within the following fifty days, the money or jewels to be returned if they lived up to the terms of the agreement, or to be handed over to the Genoese if they failed to do so.

The treaty of Turin also provided that, if peace had been restored between John V and the Genoese in Constantinople, *sicut per aliquos asseritur*, the Venetians were to have the right to come and go freely through Byzantine territories without the Genoese interposing any *impedimentum vel molestia* to their goods or persons.

And let the lord emperor Kalojohn himself receive the lord Andronicus his son back into his grace, arranging that the lord Andronicus . . . should succeed his . . . father in the Constantinopolitan empire after his said father's death and decease. . . . In the event of the . . . emperor Kalojohn's declining to return himself and bring his people back to the Catholic faith, the . . . Genoese and Vene-

²²⁴ See the reliable monograph of George T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387*, Rome, 1960, with the notes of G. J. Theodorides, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LIV (1961), 140–44.

tians are held and always required, whenever they shall have been asked by the . . . lord count of Savoy, to provide him to the best of their ability with aid, counsel, and support against . . . the emperor Kalojohn, so that by their force and power, with the propitious help of God, he may be [re]converted to the Catholic faith.

John V's devotion to the Latin Church had apparently declined with his failure to receive assistance from the west against the Turks. The Holy See was to adjudicate the "controversies and discords" which had hitherto plagued the relations between the patriarch and church of Aquileia and the doge and commune of Venice with respect to their rights and jurisdictions in the province of Istria.²²⁵

On 4 September (1381), in accordance with a decree of the preceding 10 December, thirty citizens had their names inscribed in the Golden Book, and were enrolled in the *Maggior Consiglio*, because they had stood out in the defense of Venice against the Genoese, the Carraresi, and the Hungarians. Their acquisition of the *nobiltà veneziana* was hereditary, and among those ennobled for their services to the Republic was the chronicler and chancellor Raffain Caresini; other families which now saw the door to political advancement opened to them included the Trevisan, Condulmer, Zaccaria, Cicogna, Pasqualigo di Candia, Longo, Vendramin, Calergi, Paruta, Lippomano, Donato di Ca' da Porto, and Nani da S. Vitale.²²⁶ In the next century we shall find a Condulmer as pope and a Trevisan active against the Turks as a papal admiral.

²²⁵ The text of the treaty of Turin (of 8 August, 1381) is given in the *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, II, cols. 858–906, and I have emphasized above the sections of the treaty to be found in cols. 858–59, 863–65, 871–74, and 885–86. Related documents may be found in G. Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, in the *Monumenta Hungariae historica*, III (1876), no. 213, pp. 334–45; S. Ljubić, *Listine*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV (1874), nos. CCXLI–CCLVII, pp. 119–86, of which no. CCXLI is the treaty of Turin itself; and Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III (1883), bk. VIII, nos. 89–92, 94, 96–103, 111–14, 133, 136. On the wide effects of the war over Tenedos, the so-called "war of Chioggia," see Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, III (1855), 262–99; L. A. Casati, *La Guerra di Chioggia e la pace di Torino*, Florence, 1866; and H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920, repr. 1964), 229–42, and on the sources, *ibid.*, II, 608–11.

²²⁶ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VIII, no. 95, p. 150; Raffain Caresini, *Chronica*, ad ann. 1381, ed. Ester Pastorello, in the new Muratori, *RiSS*, XII, pt. 1 (Bologna, 1922–23), 56–57; Romanin, *Venezia*, III, 300–1; Kretschmayr, *Venedig*, II, 240.

Although the Genoese had taken nearby Chioggia, the Venetians had held distant Tenedos throughout the war. Reluctantly but sincerely the Signoria now set about fulfillment of the obligation to eliminate the strategic importance of the island by destroying all its installations and removing the entire Greek population to the Venetian colonies of Crete and Negroponte. Month after month letters, orders, and envoys were sent to Zanachi Mudazzo (Muazzo), bailie and captain of Tenedos, to surrender the island to Amadeo of Savoy's commissioner, but with an independence almost incredible in a Venetian official, Mudazzo refused to do so. Offering various excuses and changing his tactics from time to time, he insisted that if he obeyed the orders of the Signoria, the island of Tenedos would inevitably fall into the hostile hands of the Genoese. His obstinacy was causing the Venetian government no little trouble in Italy, to the vast indignation of the chancellor Raffain Caresini, who dwells in his chronicle on Mudazzo's *temeraria rebellio et laesae maiestatis crimen*.²²⁷

As the pledge of good faith required by the treaty of Turin, the Venetians had turned over jewels worth 150,000 florins to the Florentines, who as a gesture of their confidence in Venetian integrity had left them on deposit in Venice, certain that the Senate would immediately set about the destruction of the fortifications of Tenedos. But in early August, 1382, two envoys from the Arno appeared before the new doge, Michele Morosini, one of the Venetian representatives at Turin, and explained that the Genoese had requested the jewels, for the two and one-half months stipulated in the treaty for the surrender of the island to Amadeo of Savoy had long since passed. The Genoese had, moreover, given weight to their remonstrance by sequestering 200,000 florins' worth of Florentine wool and merchandise which they had found easily accessible in their own harbor. The Venetians replied that they had been no whit remiss; they had complied with all the requirements of the treaty; they were doing and would do everything possible to secure the surrender of Tenedos to Amadeo. The delay had been caused by Mudazzo's treason, and the Venetian government was not responsible for the sequestration of the Florentine property, but the Signoria would

²²⁷ Caresini, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1381–1382, in *RiSS*, XII-1, 58–59.

send envoys to Genoa in an effort to secure its release.²²⁸

The Florentine embassy spurred the Venetian Senate to renewed action, and on 19 August (1382) they wrote the doge and council of Genoa that they were and had always been anxious to carry out fully the article of the peace relating to Tenedos. Two days before, on Sunday the seventeenth, Fantino Giorgio (Zorzi) had left Venice on his way to Tenedos with four armed galleys and two large cogs, with men-at-arms, archers, and heavy artillery aboard. Venice had spared no expense in outfitting Giorgio's forces, and had decreed and published the direst penalties against Zanachi Mudazzo, *ille nephandissimus proditor et rebellis*, who would pay for his execrable and atrocious treason. The Senate had also ordered that those suspected of complicity should be brought to Venice in chains, and one suspect had already been imprisoned. The Senate requested the doge and council of Genoa to write Francesco Gattilusio of Mytilene and the Genoese authorities at Pera and Chios to sell Giorgio supplies and to render him such assistance as courtesy made fit and seemly among friendly states.²²⁹ According to Caresini, Mudazzo's rebellion would not have lasted so long if he had not been receiving supplies from the Turks, which was hard to prevent because of the stormy weather which came with the advent of winter.²³⁰

Since Mudazzo had the Tenedian garrison in firm control, and had won the support of the local population, on 20 February, 1383, the Senate allowed Giorgio to bear easily on him to spare the expense and danger of dealing with

his further opposition,²³¹ and so the willful rebel finally surrendered in mid-April, and was thereafter returned to Venice under guard but apparently without humiliation.²³² In the meantime, on 30 March, the Senate had chosen two *provisores Tenedi* to work with Giorgio in the multiple tasks which lay ahead.²³³ On 19 May Giovanni Memo was elected captain of Tenedos for six months. Refusal of the post would have carried a fine of 200 ducats; the salary for the stated period of his service was to be 800. He was to be responsible for the "negotia Tenedi, que sunt maximi ponderis." Two castellans, Antonio Pisani and Jacopo Loredan, were also appointed to accompany Memo, and on 23 May the Senate decided that no Greek should be allowed to enter the castle of Tenedos, and that at least one of the castellans should always be in the castle during the day, and both of them at night.²³⁴

On 4 June (1383) Leonardo Dandolo and Pietro Emo received a commission to go as envoys to Genoa to explain that Tenedos had now been recovered from Mudazzo, and Venice was prepared to do with the island as provided for in the peace of Turin. The Venetians had been without guilt or guile in the whole affair, Dandolo and Emo were to say, and they had not incurred the penalty of losing the 150,000 florins' worth of jewels—nor had the well-meaning Florentines who had stood as guarantors for them. Now one could, alas, proceed to the "factum ruynationis Tenedi."²³⁵ The Genoese government was to be invited to send an observer to the island to see how completely Venice proposed to live up to the obligations of the peace. At one point in the discussions relating to the terms of Dandolo's and Emo's commission, the Doge Antonio Venier intervened, suggesting that it would be offensive both to God and to all mankind to disperse the Greek population of Tenedos and to destroy everything on the island. Tenedos should be pre-

²²⁸ On the problem of Tenedos and the *affaire Mudazzo*, see Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VIII, nos. 81, 92, 96–97, 100, 102–3, 120–25, 127–31, 138–40, 145. The Florentines had reason to regret standing surety for their Venetian friends, and sent more than one embassy to the lagoon to try to get the Senate to surrender the jewels to Genoa, since Venice had—for whatever reason—failed to live up to the peace of Turin as far as Tenedos was concerned (Misti, Reg. 37, fol. 102, and Reg. 38, fols. 15^v, 19^r–20^v, 21^r–22^r, 25^v, 26^r, 28). The Doge Michele Morosini died on 15 October, 1382, after a reign of four months and five days (Caresini, *Chron.*, in *RISS*, XII-1, 60).

²²⁹ Misti, Reg. 37, fol. 103^r. Fantino Giorgio's commission, dated 14 August, 1382, is given, *ibid.*, fols. 104^r–105^r, and instructs him to proceed "... non parcendo Zanachi Mudacio ullo modo sed procurando quod veniat in fortiam vestram vivus vel mortuus. . . ." The Greek inhabitants of Tenedos were to be settled at Venetian expense in Crete or Negroponte.

²³⁰ Caresini, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1382–1383, in *RISS*, XII-1, 61.

²³¹ Misti, Reg. 38, fol. 10^v: Giorgio and the local collegio were permitted "quod habeant libertatem remittendi et parcendi Zanachi Mudacio."

²³² *Ibid.*, Reg. 38, fol. 36^v, dated 23 May, 1383. Caresini, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1383, in *RISS*, XII-1, 61, says that Mudazzo begged for mercy and received it.

²³³ Misti, Reg. 38, fol. 16^v, and *cf.* fol. 29^r.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, Reg. 38, fol. 35.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, Reg. 38, fols. 42^r–43^r: "... Sumus contenti placendo eis [i.e. Januensibus] ipsum locum Tenedi facere ruinari et destrui a summo usque deorsum" (fol. 43^r).

served for its value to navigation, "and so that it should not fall into the hands of the Turks, who could easily build it up again." The doge therefore proposed that the island should be given to the Byzantine Emperor John V with the understanding that it should never again become either Venetian or Genoese. But for obvious reasons the Genoese would no more agree to that than the Venetians would have been willing to relinquish Tenedos to the emperor's son Andronicus, and so the doge's proposal was not included in the envoys' instructions.²³⁶

What would seem to be rather moderate punishments were now imposed upon Zanachi Mudazzo's accomplices in the treasonable disobedience of the Signoria's orders. Although his nephew (of the same name) was declared innocent, on 17 April (1383) the distinguished Pantaleone Barbo, who had served the Republic as bailie and captain of Negroponte, was sentenced to deprivation of all offices of state for ten years. Proposals to sentence him to six months or a year "in one of the lower prisons" and to banish him from Venice and the Veneto for five years did not pass the Senate. When the Senate came to the case of Enrico Dandolo, a galley commander accused of having given aid and counsel to Mudazzo, the doge, who had suggested the harsher punishment for Barbo, now proposed that Dandolo be confined in one of the grim *carceres inferiores* for six months. The Senate, however, banished him for five years from the island of Crete, but if within that period he re-entered the island, he was to receive three months in prison. Jacopo Vicemano, who had also been a galley commander, was not henceforth to be put in charge of any armed vessel of Venetian registry, but the Senate resisted the imposition of harsher penalties.²³⁷ These

sentences were relaxed as soon as the Tenedian furor had passed, and on 8 March, 1392 (less than ten years later), Pantaleone Barbo was sent to Constantinople as ambassador to express the Republic's distress at the death of "our true and perfect friend," the Emperor John V, and to take up various important matters with the latter's successor, Manuel II.²³⁸

With the repossession of Tenedos, plans for demolition were quickly put into effect to allay the suspicions of the Genoese. But there were said to be more than 4,000 persons on the island, and six months was not considered too long to deal with all that remained to be done.²³⁹ Humane consideration was given, as Thiriet has emphasized, to the problems of the poor Greeks, who were now to be deported from their ancestral homes to start life anew in the unfamiliar settings of Crete and Negroponte. Once they had all been removed from Tenedos (they would be compensated for their losses), demolition of houses in the town and all other habitations was to start. Wrecking crews would later tear down all fortified places, but the castle of Tenedos was to be left standing "on its feet" until the entire operation of evacuating the inhabitants and destroying their homes and other buildings had been completed.²⁴⁰

Amadeo VI of Savoy had died in southern Italy at the beginning of March, 1383, as he accompanied Louis of Anjou on the ill-managed campaign that failed to win the kingdom of Naples from Charles of Durazzo. On 28 April

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, Reg. 42, fol. 47^r.

²³⁹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VIII, no. 123, p. 156, on the alleged population of Tenedos; Caresini, *Chron.*, ad ann. 1383, in *RISS*, XII-1, 62.

²⁴⁰ Misti, Reg. 38, fols. 64^v-67^v, 74^v-76^r, 94^v, 108^v, 112^r: "Extractis vero hominibus omnibus et familiis Tenedi vel illa maiori parte . . . in bona gratia debeant incipere ad ruinandum domos burgi et omnes alias habitationes que forent super insula Tenedi, et postea de aliis locis et fortificiis, remanente in ultimis solo castro in pedibus . . ." (*ibid.*, fol. 75^r, dated 15 September, 1383). Cf. Thiriet, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXV, 235-37. On 29 May, 1384, the duke and council of Crete wrote the doge that they had given the Tenedian immigrants 33,000 *hyperperi* (10,000 still remained of the appropriation, which they would also distribute as soon as possible), and that they had assigned them state lands near Candia and in three other villages (*casalia*), which would reduce the revenues of Crete by about 1,200 *hyperperi* a year (Thomas and Predelli, *Diplomatarium*, II, doc. 114, pp. 191-92; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VIII, no. 186, pp. 170-71). More land was available in Crete to settle the Tenedians ". . . cum terra Canee propter guerras et epidimias preteritas sit valde depopulata et dishabitata" (Misti, Reg. 38, fol. 87^v).

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, Reg. 38, fol. 43^v. On 26 January, 1383, a Byzantine ambassador had appeared in Venice and requested the cession of Tenedos to John V. The Senate was willing, by a large majority, to do so "cum ista conditione quod dominus dux et comune Janue, sicut est conveniens atque iustum, teneantur et debeant nos absolvere et quietare ab illo puncto pacis quod facit mentionem de Tenedo et de eo quod fieri debet de ipso loco . . ." (Reg. 37, fol. 130^r): Genoa would have to give a similar "quittance" to the Florentines. The doge was obviously thinking of the Byzantine request when he spoke in the Senate, but it was one thing to make an agreeable reply to John V's ambassador and another to make this proposal to the Genoese, who would have immediately suspected collusion between John and Venice.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, Reg. 38, fols. 46^v-47^r.

the Venetian Senate arranged to send an embassy of condolence to Amadeo's widow the Countess Bonne and to his son Amadeo [VII], lamenting the loss of the Republic's *karissimus et intimus amicus*.²⁴¹ Amadeo's commissioner had never been able to take over Tenedos, and no one in Venice yet knew of Zanachi Mudazzo's surrender (on 18 April). Tenedos became a refuge for gulls and probably for pirates, but the Venetians maintained a protectorate over the island which, although deserted, they continued to regard as their own property. They declined to cede it to the Byzantine government, which they said would be a violation of the peace of Turin, but they sometimes used it as a depot in transit for their galleys, which was also a violation. The fortifications were not rebuilt, but the Venetians often used the island as an observation post to keep an eye on the Turks in Gallipoli. There are two later texts, well known but important, which show that Tenedos remained the pivot of Venetian policy in the Aegean.

In July, 1405, the master of the Hospitallers of Rhodes wrote the Venetian Senate, requesting leave to build a castle on Tenedos "for the defense of the Christian faith," and upon receipt of his letter in September the Senate decided to send him a verbal reply through one Zanachi Grino, who was going east as *patronus* of a pilgrim galley, "because it is much better and more discreet that [our] response should be by word of mouth than in writing." Grino was to present the master with his letters of credence from the Senate, and remind him that the Venetians spared neither labor nor expense on behalf of the faith. Tenedos belonged to them, to be sure, but according to the peace of Turin, which the late Count Amadeo of Savoy had negotiated between Venice and Genoa, "it was resolved and determined by him for the main-

tenance of peace and tranquillity between the two parties that Tenedos itself should be destroyed and demolished, so that it should never again be restored and rebuilt, which [restriction] we are obliged fully to observe."²⁴²

A half dozen years later, on 4 June, 1411, the Doge Michele Steno gave a commission to Jacopo Trevisan, who was being sent east to arrange a peace with the late Sultan Bayazid's son Musa. It was the era of Ottoman weakness (after the battle of Ankara in late July, 1402), and the Senate "did not doubt that the said lord Musa, when he has heard you, will condescend to make peace with us." According to Trevisan's instructions,

. . . you must include [in the agreement] the island of Negroponte, Pteleum, Argos and Nauplia, Modon and Coron, Patras, the island of Crete, Lepanto, the islands of Tenos and Mykonos, and all the territories of Albania. . . . Furthermore [you will make it clear] that the said peace must be observed everywhere on land and on the sea within the straits, but outside the straits from Tenedos down into the sea . . . [i.e. south and west of the island] both our people and his shall be allowed to attack and injure one another in property and in person.²⁴³

Tenedos might be the key to the Dardanelles, but the Turks were not going to unlock the door to the Aegean if the Venetians could prevent it.

²⁴² *Senatus Secreta*, Reg. 2, fol. 151^v, dated 21 September, 1405, published in C. N. Sathas, ed., *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, 9 vols., Paris, 1880-90, I, no. 11, pp. 11-12, where Sathas's copyist (p. 12, line 24) repeats the slip of the archival text (line 20), reading *unquam* for the obvious *numquam*.

²⁴³ *Misti*, Reg. 49, fol. 27^r, summarized in N. Iorga [Jorga], *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle*, 6 vols., Paris and Bucharest, 1899-1916, I, 196-97. Trevisan was being sent to "Musi Zelabi, magnus admiratus Turchorum." See in general Thiriet, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXV, 241-43.

²⁴¹ *Misti*, Reg. 38, fol. 25^r.

14. THE CRUSADES OF BARBARY (1390) AND NICOPOLIS (1396)

BY the time the treaty of Turin was signed the monkish Urban V had been dead for more than a decade. On 29 December, 1370, after the usual novena of mourning, the seventeen cardinals then at the Curia entered the conclave in the papal palace at Avignon, to which Urban had returned the preceding September. The next morning they elected Clement VI's nephew, the cultivated Cardinal Pierre Roger de Beaufort, as Pope Gregory XI.¹ His reign was beset with financial hardships, and for the most part he achieved only a moderate success in his efforts to reform the Knights Hospitallers and the Dominicans, restore the missions of the latter Order in the East, promote the inquisitorial pursuit of heretics in Europe, and effect a stable peace between France and England. Avignon remained subject to the *incursiones malignorum*, and Juan Fernández de Heredia was reappointed captain-general of the Comtat-Venaissin.² On the Italian scene the Visconti and the Florentines caused Gregory endless trouble, and even his return voyage to Rome was disagreeably prolonged (from September, 1376, to January, 1377) by adverse winds and almost unendurable storms.

Although the necessity of a crusade to check the onward march of the Turks was discussed (and perhaps frequently) at the Curia in Gregory's time, the great powers were bogged down in their own concerns, and the pope could do little more than write the usual letters. In late July, 1371, two months before the Turkish victory on the Maritsa, a Genoese embassy had come to Avignon to inform the pope and the Curia that the Turks and other

enemies of Christendom had gathered in great numbers, in *grandi multitudine congregati*, and were letting loose a "whirlwind of war" upon the lands of the eastern Christians "to destroy the name and cult of Christ." The Genoese reported that, unless an expedition (*passagium*) could bring relief by the following March, hardly a voice would be found in the threatened areas to invoke the name of Christ. Many persons were said to believe that the Turks might even invade Sicily.

The Genoese, alarmed by the news they were receiving, were preparing a *magnus apparatus galearum* to transport an expedition eastward to aid their fellow Christians against the Turkish torrent. On 1 August (1371) Gregory wrote to Jean de Grailly, the "captal of Buech," a French partisan of Edward III of England, urging him to exhort the English to make peace with the French and to help the Genoese in their plans for the crusade. Similar letters went to Count Louis of Flanders and (on 6 August) to the Doge Andrea Contarini of Venice.³ On 21 August Gregory assured the Doge Domenico di Campofregoso of Genoa that, among the anxieties the world was causing him, "this expedition is closest to our heart, . . . and we have written to several kings, princes, and other nobles . . . to induce them by whatever ways and means we could . . . to join or at least to help in this matter."⁴ But as Raynaldus observed long ago, the pope's appeals fell on deaf ears, and neither a leader of note nor a practicable plan of procedure was forthcoming.

Continual outbreaks of warfare in Europe and increasingly unsettled conditions in the

¹ On the election, see L. Mirot and H. Jassemin, eds., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Grégoire XI (1370-1378) relatives à la France*, 5 fascicules, Paris, 1935-57, fasc. 1, no. 1, cols. 1-3, and the notices to be expected in Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 4 vols., Paris, 1914-22, I, 415, 439, 460, 463, 466, and cf. vol. II, pp. 578 ff.; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1370, nos. 25-26, vol. VII (vol. XXVI of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1752), pp. 194-95, and G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon (1305-1378)*, 9th ed., Paris, 1949, pp. 122 ff.

² Mirot and Jassemin [and J. Vielliard], fasc. 2, nos. 1657-58, cols. 536-38, dated 5 August, 1374; Robert André-Michel, "Les Défenseurs des châteaux et des villes fortes dans le Comtat-Venaissin au XIV^e siècle," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LXXVI (1915), 322 ff.

³ Mirot and Jassemin, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, fasc. 1, nos. 334-35, 342, cols. 121-22, 124, with the text in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1371, no. 8, vol. VII (1752), pp. 201-2.

⁴ Oskar Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (1355-1375)*, Warsaw, 1930, repr. London, 1972, pp. 248-51, with a quotation from Gregory's letter to the doge of Genoa (*ibid.*, p. 251, note 2). One can tell little about the content of this letter from the summary in G. Mollat, ed., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Grégoire XI . . . intéressant les pays autres que la France*, 3 fascicules, Paris, 1962-65, fasc. 1, no. 266, p. 40. Letters relating to eastern affairs may be found in A. L. Tăutu, ed., *Acta Gregorii PP. XI*, Rome, 1966 (Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, Fontes, ser. III, vol. XII), but Tăutu's norm of selection has of course been papal jurisdiction rather than papal efforts to promote the crusade.

Levant made serious thought of a crusade impossible. The eastern outposts of Latin Christendom were Cyprus, Rhodes, and Smyrna. But Cyprus was not recovering from the strife and unrest caused by the murder of King Peter I; rumors of luxurious living and the relaxation of military discipline among the Hospitallers of Rhodes were disquieting to the Curia; and Smyrna, the very symbol of crusading success, was in worrisome disorder as the Genoese Pietro Raccanelli gave up the captaincy of the ever-threatened city. Gregory XI could do little or nothing about Cyprus, where the Genoese were running rampant, but he sought ways to reform the Hospitallers, and Smyrna had been the special charge of the Holy See ever since it had been captured in the halcyon days of his uncle Clement.

In letters of uncertain date Gregory directed Raymond Bérenger, the master of Rhodes, to review Pietro Raccanelli's apparently unsatisfactory performance in Smyrna, and ordered the papal collectors in Cyprus to pay Raccanelli's successor Ottobuono Cattaneo, also a Genoese, his *salarium* of 3,000 florins each year on 1 September. Since the post carried a so-called "salary" of 6,000 florins, from which the incumbent paid his mercenaries and the garrison, the collectors were to make arrangements with Cattaneo for the payment of the remaining 3,000.⁵ Raccanelli's tenure of the post may have been marred by financial mismanagement, for he was said not to have paid some of the garrison, who had therefore withdrawn from Smyrna.⁶

Gregory requested the government in Cyprus to see to the collection of the triennial tithe "pro custodia civitatis Smirnenensis," and appealed to the young King Peter II, his mother Eleanor, and the regent John of Antioch to support Cattaneo in the defense of the city.⁷ On 13 June, 1374, Cattaneo was ordered to pay from the monies he had received all salaries due the officials, mercenaries, and guardsmen in the garrison of Smyrna.⁸ But apparently Cattaneo performed his duties no more satisfac-

torily than his predecessor had done, for three months later Gregory turned over the high command at Smyrna to the master and convent of Rhodes for a period of five years (until 1379), because Cattaneo was absent from his post, and discord was rife among the archbishop of Smyrna, the mercenaries, Venetians, Genoese, Cretans, and other good Christians overseas.⁹

Like powerless popes before and after him, Gregory did what little he could against the Turks, addressing spirited appeals to the Hospitallers, Venetians, Genoese, and Neapolitans to aid Queen Maria of Armenia.¹⁰ It is not clear when the grim news of the battle of the Maritsa first reached the Curia in Avignon, but on 15 May, 1372, Gregory warned Louis the Great of Hungary to take serious measures against the Turks, who had invaded parts of Greece, subjugated the Serbs, and advanced as far as the borders of Hungary and Albania. Now they intended to continue their drive to the Adriatic to seize for themselves the port cities which had been under Hungarian control since 1358. The Venetians were urged to supply Louis with the naval armament he would need in combatting the Turks.¹¹ Since the Hungarians had displaced the Venetians in authority along the Dalmatian coast, however, there was little prospect of their receiving assistance from the Republic. On 13 November, 1372, Gregory summoned the Byzantine Emperor John V and all the Latin lords in the Levant to meet on the following 1 October in a great congress at Thebes, the capital of the Catalan duchy of Athens, to form a union for offensive action against the Turks on land

⁵ Mollat, fasc. 1, nos. 1370-71, p. 187, and cf. nos. 551, 937, and 941.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fasc. 1, nos. 1406, 1411, and fasc. 2, nos. 2700-1, 2705, 3433.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fasc. 1, nos. 935-36, p. 129, dated 15 August, 1372, and cf. nos. 1424, 1511, 1524, 1540-41, and fasc. 2, nos. 2694-2704.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fasc. 2, nos. 2698, 2706, pp. 42-44, and cf. fasc. 1, no. 2106, p. 292.

⁹ *Ibid.*, fasc. 2, no. 2876, p. 66, dated 21 September, 1374, and cf. nos. 2768 ff., 3117 ff. On 4 October Gregory ordered Cattaneo to surrender Smyrna to the reluctant Hospitallers, to whom he was to give an accounting of his administration of the captaincy (no. 2903, pp. 70-71). In December, 1375, there was still talk of a *passagium generale faciendum contra Turchos* (no. 3622, p. 167), but it was probably a device to collect money.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fasc. 1, nos. 512, 517, 518-19, dated in January, 1372, and fasc. 3, no. 3701, p. 1, dated 22 January, 1376; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1372, no. 30, vol. VII (1752), pp. 225-26. Gregory's relations with the Emperor John V Palaeologus were far from close, his first letter to John being dated 25 January, 1372, more than a year after his election (no. 521, on which cf. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance*, pp. 251-52).

¹¹ Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, fasc. 1, no. 745, p. 104, and cf. nos. 746, 1177, 1773, 1934; Gregory's letter of 15 May, 1372, is given in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. cit., no. 28, vol. VII (1752), pp. 223-24.

and sea,¹² but there is no evidence that any of those to whom the appeal was sent (if it was ever sent) actually appeared at Thebes, and certainly no offensive alliance was formed against the Turks during Gregory's reign.

Some months later Gregory wrote the Byzantine emperor again, repeating an earlier proposal for a *certa unio galearum* for action against the Turks, but of course it should be preceded by the *unio ecclesiarum*, which the well-known John Lascaris Calopherus and Demetrius Cydones stood ready to negotiate with the emperor's assistance. Gregory thought the time had come for this union of galleys and Churches, "because," as he stated, "the cities of Constantinople and Thessalonica, and other territories which you now possess, are said to be in continual peril, almost hemmed in by these same Turks."¹³

Gregory's galleys would have to come largely from the Venetians and the Genoese, and the former were embroiled with Francesco da Carrara of Padua, and the latter were at war with the Lusignan in Cyprus. Gregory was himself at fierce odds with the Visconti, and Amadeo VI of Savoy at equally fierce odds with the marquis of Saluzzo. There was constant conflict in France, where among others Counts Jean d'Armagnac and Gaston de Foix had frequent recourse to arms. Gregory was naturally well aware, as he had occasion to write Duke Philip the Bold of Burgundy (on 18 May, 1375), that as long as wars were being waged in France and other Christian kingdoms, there was little to be gained by "planning for the crusade" (*tractatus passagii*), but the establishment of peace would find "innumerable men-at-arms" ready to embark upon such an enterprise, and then with divine guidance constructive planning for the *passagium* might begin.¹⁴ Later in the year Gregory delayed his return to Italy in the hope that peace could be restored between France and England.¹⁵ When he finally did return, Italy was in violent upheaval, the

papal states largely in revolt, and the Florentines in arms against him in the "war of the Eight Saints." The war of Tenedos and Chioggia broke out before his death (in Rome) on 27 March, 1378, and it is small wonder that he never had the opportunity of "planning for the crusade."

After the peace of Turin there was an increase in the volume of eastern trade. The Venetian galleys, for example, could make their regular runs more safely to Romania, Tana, and Trebizond and to Beirut and Alexandria. Pilgrims continued to make the long, uncomfortable voyage to Jerusalem.¹⁶ But until the respite provided by the battle of Ankara (1402), fear of the Turks grew steadily, especially in the northern Aegean, for Ottoman armies were almost everywhere in the Balkans, applying relentless pressure to the Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgarians. Ottoman forces occupied Serres in 1383, Sofia in 1384 or 1385, Nish in 1386, Larissa in Thessaly in 1386, and Thessalonica in 1387. The battle of Kossovo in June, 1389, brought Serbia under Ottoman domination for almost four centuries. In July, 1393, Tirnovo was sacked, and Bulgaria became an Ottoman province, its days of greatness irretrievably lost.¹⁷

¹⁶ Cf. the Venetian Misti, Reg. 38, fol. 27^r, dated 12 May, 1383, senatorial resolutions licensing twenty-seven pilgrims "or thereabouts" to sail on Paolo de la Colla's "galeota . . . que vadit ad partes Syrie," and another sixty or so to sail on Francesco Dolfin's galley, which was also going to Syria.

¹⁷ Franz Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.-15. Jahrhundert)*, Munich, 1944, pp. 29-79 (*Sudosteuropäische Arbeiten*, no. 34). Babinger deals at length with the European and Ottoman sources and with the chronological difficulties involved in seeking to depict the various stages of the Turkish conquest of the Balkans. If the Turks took Tirnovo for the first time in 1388, the Bulgarians must have recovered it, because there is no doubt that the final and lasting occupation of the Šišmanid capital occurred on 17 July, 1393 (*ibid.*, p. 34). On the taking of Serres and Thessalonica, note George T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382-1387*, Rome, 1960, pp. 65-76 and ff. According to Dennis, the Turks held Thessalonica from the spring of 1387 until the Emir Suleiman returned the city to the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II sometime after the treaty of January or February, 1403, on which see his article, "The Second Turkish Capture of Thessalonica: 1391, 1394 or 1430?" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVII (1964), 53-61. He believes that the "second" occupation of the city came in 1430 when, as we shall observe in the second volume, it was taken from the Venetians. A. E. Bakalopoulos, "Zur Frage der zweiten Einnahme Thessalonikis durch die Türken, 1391-1394," *ibid.*, LXI (1968), 285-90, has argued cogently however that, while Thessalonica remained a

¹² Mollat, fasc. 1, nos. 1172-74, p. 162; Täutu, *Acta Gregorii PP. XI* (1966), nos. 48 ff., pp. 93 ff.; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1372, no. 29, vol. VII (1752), pp. 224-25, and see below, Chapter 17, p. 460b, with refs.

¹³ Mollat, fasc. 1, no. 1933, pp. 269-70, dated 21 June, 1373; Täutu, *Acta Gregorii PP. XI*, no. 77, pp. 149-50; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. cit., no. 2, vol. VII (1752), p. 231.

¹⁴ Mirot and Jassemmin, fasc. 2, no. 1898, cols. 613-14.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 1943, col. 630, dated 3 August, 1375, and cf. nos. 1970-71, 1991, 1997, 2002 ff.

At this point western Islam must claim our attention briefly although it had but slight connection with the Levant. In the mid-thirteenth century the Muwaḥḥid ("Almohad") empire had fallen to pieces after the fashion of empires, and the Naṣrids now ruled in the Andalusian kingdom of Granada. Along the southwestern littoral of the Mediterranean, Muwaḥḥid rule had been taken over by the Marīnids of Morocco, who had the important centers of Marrākush (Marrakesh) and Fās (Fez) under their control; the Ziyānids of western Algeria, whose capital at Tilimsān (Tlemcen) required constant defense against the Marīnids; and the Ḥafṣids of eastern Algeria, Tunisia, and Tripolitania, who held Bijāyah (Bugia), Tunis, al-Mahdiyyah (Mahdia), and the island of Jerbah (Jerba). At this time the Ḥafṣid ruler, the "king of Tunis," was Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad II ibn-Muḥammad (1360–1394),¹⁸ whose subjects enjoyed a high degree of prosperity, and whose ports attracted galleys and trading ships from Catalonia and the Italian states, Alexandria and the Syrian coast. Aḥmad II's ports, however, were also havens for the "Barbary corsairs," who attacked the northern coastlines as well as Catalan, French, and Italian merchantmen. "They appear unexpectedly," says Ibn-Khaldūn,

and carry off everything that falls into their hands. They also attack ships of the unbelievers, frequently seize them, and return to port laden with booty and captives. Thus Bugia and the other western ports [of the Ḥafṣid realm] have become full of captives. The streets of these towns resound with the noise of their chains, especially when these poor unfortunates, loaded with irons, spread out in all directions to set about their daily tasks. The

tribute-paying dependency of the Ottoman state from 1387 to 1391, Bayazid forcibly incorporated the city in his growing empire in the latter year (cf. Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chaps. 13, 19 [Bonn, pp. 50, 92]). On the battle of Kossovo in Serbian and Albanian songs, some of which are long and full of circumstantial detail, see Stavro Skendi, *Albanian and South Slavic Oral Epic Poetry*, Philadelphia, 1954, repr. New York, 1969, pp. 57–71 (Memoirs of the American Folklore Society, vol. 44).

¹⁸ For the names of the rulers of the Ḥafṣid, Ziyānid, and Marīnid dynasties as spelled on their coins, see Harry W. Hazard, *The Numismatic History of Late Medieval North Africa*, New York, 1952, pp. 69–85, et passim (Studies of the American Numismatic Society, no. 8), and note his schematic presentation of the facts in the *Atlas of Islamic History*, 3rd ed., Princeton, 1954, pp. 20–21. The political history of northwest Africa in this period is sketched in apparently reliable detail by Robert Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Ḥafṣides des origines à la fin du XV^e siècle*, Paris, 1940, I, 104–209 (Publications de l'Institut d'études orientales d'Alger, no. VIII).

price of their ransom is fixed so high that it is very difficult and often even impossible for them to pay it.¹⁹

From the interior of Africa, Berber traders emerged with ivory and ostrich plumes, as Mirot has noted, and the Ḥafṣid markets supplied Latin merchants with dried fruits, dates, olive oil, salt fish, spices, hides, cotton, coral, carpets, slaves, and other commodities for which there always was a large demand.²⁰ If the food-stuffs were bulky, the distances to the Italian ports on the Tyrrhenian Sea and to Genoa, Marseille, and Barcelona were much shorter than those traversed by the convoys to the Bosphorus and the Black Sea, Beirut and Alexandria. In the western Mediterranean, however, trade suffered intolerable harassment from the pirates and slave-traders who seized not only the cargoes but also the crews.²¹

Having reached a necessary understanding with their commercial rivals in Catalonia, the Genoese were joined in 1388 in an anti-Moorish coalition by the Sicilians and Pisans. Their purpose was to deal with the pirate haunts in the domain of Aḥmad II, especially those on Jerba and the other islands in the Gulf of Gabes. The Genoese furnished a dozen galleys under Raffaele Adorno, brother of the Doge Antoniotto; the Pisans, another five; and the Sicilian government of Queen Maria, three large galleys under the admiral Manfredo de Chiaramonte.²² In the mid-summer (of 1388) the allied fleet occupied the islands in the Gulf of Gabes. The Genoese gave up all rights of conquest in Jerba and the other islands for an indemnity of 36,000 gold florins. Manfredo de Chiaramonte paid the required sum, and installed a garrison on Jerba. As

¹⁹ Ibn-Khaldūn, *Histoire des berbères et des dynasties musulmanes de l'Afrique septentrionale*, trans. Baron [MacGuckin] de Slane and ed. Paul Casanova, III (Paris, 1934), 117.

²⁰ Léon Mirot, "Une Expédition française en Tunisie au XIV^e siècle: Le Siège de Mahdia (1390)," *Revue des études historiques*, XCVII (1931), 363.

²¹ Cf. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1388, nos. 1–3, vol. VII (1752), pp. 505–6.

²² Maria was the daughter of the late Catalan King Frederick III of Sicily. In November, 1391, she married Martin of Aragon-Catalonia, who as her consort became king of Sicily and bore also the title duke of Athens and Neopatras (cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatras: Regestes et notices pour servir à l'histoire des duchés catalans [1311–1394]," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXV [1955], nos. 211–12, pp. 153–54, 155). Martin was the grandson of Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia, long the enemy of the Genoese.

suzerain of the Catalan kingdom of Sicily (*Trinacria*), on 29 January, 1389, Pope Urban VI bestowed Jerba and the Qerqenah Islands (east of Sfax) upon Chiaramonte and his heirs as an hereditary fief for which homage was to be rendered and fealty sworn to the Holy See.²³

The expedition of 1388 was a step toward the suppression of the Barbary pirates, whose forays increased the perils and reduced the profits of seaborne commerce. But it was only a step, and (as Froissart tells us) the news soon spread far and wide in France and other countries that the Genoese wanted "to form an army to go into Barbary." They were ready to provide ship's biscuit, "fresh water and dry wine," and the galleys and ships to carry all the knights and squires who wanted to join them in a venture against the infidel port of Mahdia, in the Hafsid realm of Tunisia, "laquelle ville on appelle Affrique." Just as Calais was the key to easy entry into and exit from France and Flanders, says Froissart, so was Mahdia the "clef et retour" to and from the three Moslem kingdoms on the Barbary coast. It was also a "warren" (*garenne*) of pirates, whose sudden raids might strike at any coast or island in the western Mediterranean. In addition to the supplies and galleys which the Genoese would make available to a crusading expedition against Mahdia, they also proposed to recruit 12,000 crossbowmen and 8,000 "gros varlets" equipped with lances and shields. A crusade required chivalric leadership of high repute, however, and since for years the Genoese galley and crossbow had been put at the service of the French in their wars with the English, the Doge Antoniotto Adorno and the Anziani turned to France. A Genoese embassy thus waited upon the young King Charles VI at Toulouse in December, 1389,

or early January, 1390. According to Cabaret d'Orville, their spokesman told Charles, "Do not doubt that if 'Auffricque' [Mahdia] were in Christian hands—which, if it please God, we shall take—the three infidel kings and their countries would be destroyed or they will accept the Christian faith, which would be a beautiful thing for your Majesty, seeing that you are the greatest king in Christendom."²⁴

The sixteenth-century Genoese historian Foglietta says that the envoys exhorted Charles VI to follow the example of his forebears,²⁵ and they themselves were resolved to practice what they preached. For more than three centuries pirates had been preying on commercial shipping in the western Mediterranean. As early as 1087 a league of the Italian maritime states, including Genoa and Pisa, had seized and sacked Mahdia, but had made no effort to hold the seagirt fortress. A Norman fleet, sent by Roger II of Sicily into the Gulf of Gabes in 1135, had taken the island of Jerba. A decade later the Normans captured Tripoli (in 1146), and in the summer of 1148 they occupied Mahdia itself, bringing the Zirid dynasty to an end. Continuing an extraordinary career of conquest, they also took over the coastal cities of Gabes, Bona (ancient Hippo), Susa, and Sfax; Roger II assumed the improbable title *rex Africae*, but after his death in 1154 internal dissension in the Norman kingdom of Sicily and southern Italy as well as war with the Byzantine empire weakened the Norman hold on Tunisia. At this point the puritanical sect of the Muwahhids (Almohads), fired by religious zeal, swept through the erstwhile Norman conquests in Tunisia, and at the beginning of 1160 rewon Mahdia for Islam, thus obliterating the Norman "kingdom" in North Africa.²⁶ These events were long remembered, and once again the spirit of the crusade was descending upon the chivalry of France. At precisely this time (in 1388–1389) old Philippe

²³ Giorgio Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1388, in *RISS*, XVII (Milan, 1730), col. 1128; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1389, nos. 6–7, vol. VII (1752), pp. 514–15; Uberto Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, trans. Francesco Serdonati, Genoa, 1597, bk. ix, p. 348 (reprinted in the *Historiae urbium et regionum Italiae rariores*, no. LXXII, Bologna, no date); Jos. Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886, I, 166–67; Louis de Mas Latrie, ed., *Traité de paix et de commerce . . . concernant les relations des chrétiens avec les arabes de l'Afrique septentrionale au moyen âge*, 2 vols., Paris, 1866, repr. New York, 1965, I, 239–40. As noted below, the Pisan government later claimed that their state had never joined the league against the king of Tunis, but that Pisan ship-owners had merely leased galleys to Chiaramonte (*ibid.*, I, 243–44).

²⁴ Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., *Œuvres de Froissart*, XIV (Brussels, 1872), 151–53, 213; Jean Cabaret d'Orville, *La Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon*, ed. A. M. Chazaud, Paris, 1876, chap. LXXII, pp. 218–20; L. Bellaguet, ed., *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denis, contenant le règne de Charles VI, de 1380 à 1422*, I (Paris, 1839), 648, 650 (in the Docs. inédits sur l'hist. de France). Cf. R. Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides*, I (1940), 199–202.

²⁵ Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, bk. ix, p. 348.

²⁶ Helene Wieruszowski, "The Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Crusades," in K. M. Setton, R. W. Wolff, and H. W. Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, II (2nd ed., Madison, Wisc., 1969), 18–32, with full notice of the sources.

de Mézières was writing his famous *Songe du vieil pèlerin* with its elaborate plans for a series of crusades, one of which was to be directed against North Africa. His work, addressed to Charles VI, undoubtedly had its influence upon both the king and the high nobility of France.²⁷

Cabaret states that Charles found the Genoese requests for leadership and assistance "justes et raisonnables," and promised his reply within two days. According to Froissart, the Genoese wanted "as chief and captain one of the king's uncles or his brother [Louis], the duke of Touraine," but the latter was only eighteen at the time, and Charles and the royal council agreed "que ce n'estoit pas ung voiage pour luy." But if the strong-willed young Louis, later the duke of Orléans, who had just married Gian Galeazzo's daughter Valentina Visconti, had wanted to lead the Barbary crusade, the weak-minded Charles could hardly have prevented him. Only the year before, Louis and the "Marmousets" had helped Charles free himself from the tutelage of the royal uncles, especially Philip the Bold of Burgundy. Enterprising and ambitious, Louis had no intention of absenting himself from the French scene for such an unpredictable adventure as a crusade. No, "it was not a voyage for him," nor for Philip the Bold, the victor at Roosebeke (in 1382), who had become the count of Flanders, and was too much concerned with Flemish affairs. John, the duke of Berry, peace-loving patron of the arts, was neither sufficiently interested nor competent to lead an expedition overseas.

In June, 1389, a three years' truce had been concluded with England, French knighthood was finding no glory on the battlefield, and after the two days' deliberation with his council, Charles gave the Genoese his assent to French leadership and participation in the proposed expedition: "Je vous baille pour vostre chief," he told them, "bel oncle, le duc de Bourbon, qui est ung tel chevalier comme vous savez. . . ." The choice had fallen, then, on the king's maternal uncle, Louis II, the "good duke" of Bourbon, who (says Cabaret) had pleaded for the command, "for it is what I have most desired in [all] the world, and after mundane deeds, it is a beautiful thing to serve God." He also said that he could find in his

own domains all the knights and squires who would be needed, and they would not fail to respond to the call to arms. When Charles had imparted the good news to the Genoese, they are said to have fallen on their knees to thank him for giving them "the prince whom they wanted most."²⁸ If through the years Louis of Bourbon had envied the exploits of his crusading brother-in-law, the late Amadeo VI of Savoy, here at last was his chance to win fame as a champion of the faith against the infidel. He is said to have accounted himself fortunate to follow in the footsteps of his blessed ancestor S. Louis and, like him perhaps, also to end his military career fighting the Moslems in Tunisia.²⁹

Since negotiations were still in progress to convert the three years' truce with England into a more lasting peace, the king's bourgeois councillors, the Marmousets, were averse to stripping the realm of its defenders. Consequently, as Froissart says, "all those who wanted to go did not do so," for everyone would have to pay his own expenses. No lord could recruit followers who were not of his own *hostel*, and no one was to be allowed to leave France without the king's safe-conduct. There were to be no varlets in the host, only "gentlemen" and men-at-arms, and knights and squires were to be sought from other lands than France.³⁰ Both Froissart and Cabaret delight in recording the names of great nobles who joined the "good duke" Louis of Bourbon, and volunteers flocked to the crusading standards from the heartlands of France and from Brittany, Normandy, and England. There were even some recruits from hostile Aragon-Catalonia, which had long contested possession of the then strategic island of Sardinia with the seafaring Genoese. Louis had enrollment lists drawn up, and finding that they contained some 1,500 *gentilshommes* (the limit imposed by the king), he wrote to the Doge Antoniotto Adorno to be sure that the Genoese were preparing transports and gathering provisions enough for his army. The Genoese replied that

²⁷ Cf. Mézières, *Le Songe du vieil pèlerin*, ed. G. W. Coopland, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1969, esp. II, 96-103, 430-40, and cf. N. Iorga, *Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1896, pp. 466-71.

²⁸ Cabaret d'Orville, *Chronique du bon duc Loys*, chap. LXXIII, pp. 220-21; Froissart, *Œuvres*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XIV, 154. If Louis of Touraine stepped forward in the council and offered himself for the command, as Froissart says, it was only a knightly gesture, not to be taken seriously. On the expedition to Barbary, note in general the old but excellent work of Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 169 ff.

²⁹ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 652.

³⁰ Froissart, XIV, 155.

they could carry 6,000 *hommes d'armes* to the Barbary coast, for they had twenty-two galleys ready and eighteen ships (*nefs*): "Wherefore may it please you that you and all your people should be in Genoa the week after the feast of S. John [24 June, 1390], and you will find everything ready here for the passage overseas."³¹

Cabaret's account of Louis's enrollment lists is probably accurate, for Mirot has collected the names of 232 *gentilshommes* (or at least most of them were) who accompanied Louis to Mahdia, of whom 76 are said to have lost their lives or to have been captured in the course of the crusade.³² About the beginning of February (1390), before returning to Paris, Charles VI "went to Avignon to see Pope Clement [VII], and with him the duke of Bourbon, who was glad to go there to ask leave of the pope to proceed against the infidels [*mescréans*] and to seek absolution from punishment and sin for himself and for his people: the holy father did so most willingly—for the duke of Bourbon and his people and the Genoese, and for all those who were joining his army."³³ But money was needed as well as the papal indulgence, and Louis of Touraine loaned the good duke 20,000 florins, and Charles VI gave him 12,000 gold francs. On 22 March Charles made a further grant of 20,630 francs to those who were going on the crusade to Barbary, and Louis of Touraine's treasurer paid out 13,530 francs to various of his lordly dependents.³⁴ Obviously everyone did not go "à ses frais."

Although the duke of Bourbon had to look to Provence for the wine and wheat (for ship's biscuit) which the Genoese had blithely

promised to provide, on 1 July, 1390, according to plan, they did convey him and the French crusaders from Marseille to Genoa,³⁵ where the English, Burgundian, Flemish, and other crusaders were gathering. Exaggerated rumors of the size of the expedition reached the ailing King John I of Aragon-Catalonia, and he ordered alerts to be maintained in the Balearic Islands and at Alghero and Cagliari in Sardinia.³⁶ Genoa was to be the port of embarkation for the whole army, to which the chronicler of S. Denis says the Genoese contributed 1,000 crossbowmen and 2,000 men-at-arms, not counting the sailors, who were estimated at about 4,000. Jean Juvénal des Ursins, archbishop of Rheims in the middle of the fifteenth century, also puts the Genoese contingents at 1,000 crossbowmen and 4,000 sailors, well armed and well equipped, but says nothing of the men-at-arms.³⁷

Blessing the fleet before its departure presented an awkward problem, for it was of course the era of the Great Schism. As Jean Juvénal notes, the French adhered to the Avignonese Pope Clement VII, who had granted the crusaders the plenary indulgence, but the Genoese and certain other groups of crusaders recognized Boniface IX as pope in Rome. According to Jean Juvénal, the high command issued orders that no one should mention the conflict of obediences, but that all should join together in a spirit of fraternal devotion to employ their union "contre les mescréans, en la defense de la foy catholique."³⁸ The chronicler of S. Denis, however, says that controversy arose in the host at this point *occasione scismatis*, but that following the advice of wise counsellors, the leaders of the expedition decided to have two prelates of each obedience bless the fleet, thus protecting their adherents with the sign of the cross and with the usual prayers.³⁹

The fleet sailed from Genoa on or about 3

³¹ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXIII, pp. 222–23. The Religious of S. Denis, *Chron. de Chas. VI*, I, 652, also puts Louis of Bourbon's army at 1,500 knights, squires, and crossbowmen (*milites et scutiferi ac quoque balistarii*). According to Giorgio Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1389, in *RiSS*, XVII (1730), cols. 1128–29, there were forty galleys and about twenty large transports (*magna navigia*) employed on the Barbary crusade.

³² Mirot, "Une Expédition française en Tunisie," *Revue des études historiques*, XCVII (1931), 369–72, 393, and esp. pp. 397–406. (Mirot counts "231" knights and squires, of whom 76 did not return from the crusade.) Cf. the list of 180 names in Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, II, *Pièces justificatives*, no. iv, pp. 14–17; 12 of these 180 do not appear in Mirot's list, which actually totals 232, and so includes 64 new names, and corrects several others, such as "Clinton" for "Climbo."

³³ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXIII, pp. 223–24.

³⁴ Mirot, *Rev. études hist.*, XCVII, 369.

³⁵ Cabaret d' Orville, chaps. LXXIV–LXXV, pp. 224–28.

³⁶ Mirot, *op. cit.*, pp. 374–76.

³⁷ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 652, 654; Jean Juvénal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI, roy de France, . . . depuis 1380 jusques à 1422*, eds. J. F. Michaud and J. J. F. Poujoulat, in the *Nouvelle Collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, 1st ser., II (Paris and Lyon, 1850), 383a.

³⁸ Juvénal, *Histoire de Charles VI*, pp. 383a–384b.

³⁹ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 654. Mirot, *op. cit.*, p. 376, gives the impression that Urban VI (d. 15 October, 1389) was still alive, but Jean Juvénal was well aware that Boniface IX (1389–1404) held the Roman see at the time of Louis of Bourbon's crusade.

July, 1390, and Froissart dilates on the beauty of the sight, as the banners and pennons floated in the breeze, the sun shone on the shields richly blazoned with the arms of great lords, and trumpets, clarions, and fifes resounded in the harbor.⁴⁰ The admiral of the host was the Genoese Giovanni Centurione, otherwise known as Oltramarino. Froissart tells us that the varlets and horses were left behind. The former could presumably take care of themselves, but a horse worth sixty francs could then be got in Genoa for ten. He also says that there were all told in the fleet about 120 galleys, 200 ships carrying men-at-arms and crossbowmen, and more than 100 transports with provisions and equipment.⁴¹ The chronicler of S. Denis speaks with poetic ambiguity of "eighty ships [*naves*] to be run by the art of oarsmen and with assistance from the winds."⁴² Cabaret, who wrote forty years after the events he describes, based his account upon the recollections of old Jean de Châteaumorand, who had accompanied the duke of Bourbon on the crusade. With all his imperfections, Cabaret seems to be the best literary source for the expedition, and he informs us flatly that the fleet consisted of 22 galleys and 18 transports (*nefs*),⁴³ which probably comes close to the mark.

The fleet sailed southeast from Genoa toward Portovenere at the entrance to the Gulf of Spezia, then due south past the tiny Isola di Gorgona, and passing between Capraia and Elba skirted the eastern coasts of Corsica and Sardinia, heading for the Gulf of Cagliari to take on fresh water and food. At Cagliari the Genoese avoided conflict with the Catalans, "and passed the 'gouffre du Lyon,' which is very perilous and fearful to pass, but by the way they were going they could not avoid it." They ran into a terrible storm, according to Froissart, and were in danger of all being lost; the buffeting waves and roaring winds rendered seamanship useless, and there was nothing to do but await the will of God and the turn of chance. The galleys and transports were scattered, "l' un çà, l' autre là," but after a day and a night of tempest, the sea became calm and the winds gentle, and some of the

galleys soon reached the island which Froissart calls "Comminères," Cabaret "Connillière," and the Genoese "Conigliera." Froissart locates it "à trente milles d' Affrique," and Cabaret "à seize lieues d' Auffricque," well over thirty miles from Mahdia. The map suggests that the island in question is probably Kuriates off the eastern coast of Tunisia, just east of Sousse (Susa) and Monastir. The crusaders and their Genoese navigators had realized that they might well become separated at sea, and had already agreed that "Conigliera" should be their place of rendezvous. Those who had been driven farthest afield took the longest to reach the island, where the host spent nine days. The first to arrive got the most rest, and the leaders took "counsel and collation together," discussing their plans for the attack on Mahdia.⁴⁴

The Genoese captains having given Louis of Bourbon and his barons their "advis et conseil" on the best way to effect the initial landing at Mahdia, the fleet set sail on a calm sea, with banners and pennons afloat in the breeze, and "la navie des crestiens estoit belle et grosse et bien ordonnée." By late afternoon they were in sight of the huge defense towers on the thickly populated peninsula of Mahdia, which jutted out into the sea a mile from the commercial suburb of Zawila, where Genoese traders must have been well known to the inhabitants.⁴⁵ Reports had of course already reached the Moslems of the crusaders' approach, and now sentinels on the high towers sounded tambours and drums to give warning of their arrival. It was a beautiful night, says Froissart, clear and calm, "environ la Magdalène" (Friday, 22 July, 1390). The Moslems are said to have held a council of war, and finally decided not to oppose the Christian landing, believing that

⁴⁴ Froissart, XIV, 158–59, 212; Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXV, p. 229; Juvénal, *Histoire de Charles VI*, p. 384a; *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 654, 656, who in describing the storm claims that "ab hiis qui rebus interfuerunt didisci [*sic*] tunc omnes animo consternatos extitisse, credentes quod eis discrimen inevitabile immineret. . . ."

⁴⁵ Mahdia proper was built on a peninsula joined to the mainland by a narrow isthmus, "much as the hand is joined to the wrist," and was a pirate haunt from the eleventh century to the nineteenth; note Mirot, *Rev. études hist.*, XCVII, 378–81; Geo. Marçais, "Al-Mahdiyya," *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, III (1936), 121–22; and Aziz S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1938, pp. 412–13. Froissart, XIV, 222, describes the fortifications on the basis of accounts he had received from eyewitnesses (*cf.*, *ibid.*, pp. 216–17). On the modern town, which contains about 15,000 inhabitants, note *Tunisie*, Paris: Guides Bleus, 1971, pp. 332–34.

⁴⁰ Froissart, XIV, 157.

⁴¹ Froissart, XIV, 157.

⁴² *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 652.

⁴³ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXV, p. 229, and *cf.* Gustave Schlumberger, "Jean de Châteaumorand . . .," in *Byzance et croisades*, Paris, 1927, pp. 281–336.

they were safe within their ample fortifications, and that the crusaders would eventually succumb to heat, sickness, frustration, and the difficulties of securing fresh water and supplies.⁴⁶

Plans for disembarkation had already been devised at Conigliera, and the day after the fleet had dropped anchor offshore, the advance-guard of 600 men-at-arms and a thousand crossbowmen made the first landing under the command of Enguerrand VII de Coucy and Philippe d'Artois, count of Eu. They were quickly drawn up *en ordonnance de bataille* to await a Berber attack. Archers shot at them from the walls, but when no sortie was attempted, "the duke of Bourbon hastily disembarked from his galley with all his 'battle' and all the others of the rear-guard," which included the English, Genoese, and other contingents. Froissart identifies some sixty nobles whose tents were pitched on the shore; he could not name them all, he says, for it would be too much to write, but there were 1,400 warriors in the Christian encampment, *tous gentilshommes*. The siege of Mahdia had now begun by land and sea, as the Genoese galleys blockaded the only water-gate, and the army cut off access to the town by the three gates in the landward walls. On the evening of the third day, says Cabaret, "à l'heure que l'en souppoit en l'ost," the Moslems made a sudden sortie from the three landward gates, hoping to catch the Christians off their guard; but their attack failed; they lost 300 men, fled back to the shelter of their walls, and probably did not attempt another full-scale sortie for the remainder of the siege.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Froissart, XIV, 212–21, who thinks that the feast of S. Mary Magdalene fell on a Wednesday in 1390 (*ibid.*, pp. 217, 223). The chronicler of S. Denis relates that the king of Tunis had assembled a "vast multitude of Saracens" to oppose the crusaders—6,000 for the defense of Mahdia and 40,000 on the mainland, "et ibi expectare christicolae pede fixo" (*op. cit.*, I, 656). He also states that the expedition took a whole month (*per mensem integrum*) to get from Genoa to Mahdia (I, 654), which would put the arrival of the Christian host at the beginning of August. But on 7 August an agent of Francesco Datini da Prato wrote from Genoa that a ship from Trapani or Palermo had just brought the news of the Christians' successful landing at Mahdia despite the Berbers' fierce opposition (*dopo molta battaglia*), on which see Mirot, *Rev. études hist.*, XCVII, 382, note 2. First reports of this sort are more likely to be valuable for the dates than for the details they give.

⁴⁷ Cabaret d'Orville, chap. LXXV, pp. 229–31; Froissart, XIV, 223–26. The latter tells the story of an attempted sortie from Mahdia which was supposedly frightened off by

The Christians were fed from the transports anchored offshore, and they received wine from Candia as well as provisions from Naples and Sicily, but each day brought new hardships. Lacking horses, they could not scour the countryside; they were short of wood for cooking and timber to make lodgings for the tentless soldiery. The kings of Tunis, Morocco, and Bugia had sent "all their best warriors," says Froissart; they set up their camps in the fields and on the shore, with thick woods (and hills) at their rear, all at safe distances from the crusaders' narrow quarters outside Mahdia. Froissart thinks there were 30,000 Moslem foot and archers and 10,000 or more horse; however many there actually were, they were "souvent raffreschis," for camels and other beasts of burden brought them frequent supplies. Every day, "ou du soir ou du matin," they assailed the Christians in hit-and-run attacks.⁴⁸

The Genoese had reported that the "three Saracen kings" were coming with 60,000 horse to break the siege of Mahdia, and Cabaret assures us that such proved to be the case.⁴⁹ To prevent the daily attacks, the duke of Bourbon had the peninsula of Mahdia fenced off from the mainland by a cordon of ropes (presumably carried on stakes) "d'une mer à autre" to a height of four feet, so that the Moslem horsemen could not jump it. This would be high enough, the Genoese assured him, to keep "celle canaille" out of their encampment. Galley oars were twisted into the ropes and fastened upright to support crossbows and improve the archers' aim. Men-at-arms were also posted at set intervals along the line, and the duke himself with a thousand "combatans" and 500 crossbowmen undertook to cut off any Moslem sortie that might be

a "congrégation de dames toutes blanches," led by the Virgin Mary carrying a white banner with a red cross—the Moslems retreated in haste "sans rien faire" (XIV, 234–36).

⁴⁸ Froissart, XIV, 227–29; *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 660; Foglietta, *Dell'Istoria di Genova* (1597), p. 349. According to Jean Juvénal, p. 384a, the king of Tunis had put a garrison of 2,000 men in Mahdia, which he calls Carthage, and 40,000 in the field, and we have noted above that the chronicler of S. Denis says that the king of Tunis had sent 6,000 men into the city *ad municionem ville*, and had put 40,000 *in campestribus*. Cabaret d'Orville, chap. LXXVII, p. 235, states that the Moslems settled into their camps only a crossbow-shot away from the horseless Christian host, "seulement le trect d'une arbaleste."

⁴⁹ Cabaret d'Orville, chaps. LXXVI–LXXVII, pp. 232, 235; Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 418, apparently believes that the Moslem forces are to be reckoned "as roughly between forty and sixty thousand."

attempted from the city's main landward gate. His pennon was borne by Jean de Château-morand, Cabaret's informant for the whole history of the Mahdia crusade.⁵⁰

There was probably some communication between the besieged and the relief forces sent by the three kings, who had arrived with a blare of trumpets, fifes, and clarions. After their first unsuccessful sally the besieged had decided to stay put and allow heat, sickness, and dwindling supplies to defeat the invaders. Shortly after their arrival, according to Cabaret, the Moslem relief forces risked one encounter with the Christians "who, when they saw their cowardice, advanced to meet them, especially those who were so ordered, and they struck at them stoutly." The Moslems retreated, losing sixty fine horses and a hundred men. Despite the alleged disparity in numbers, the Christians tried to draw the enemy into battle. There were frequent skirmishes, one side or the other driving their opponents back, "car ainsi est le mestier d'armes," but adopting the strategy of the garrison in Mahdia, the Moslem relief forces avoided any engagement that might prove more decisive, and this continued (we are told) for forty-two days.⁵¹

At a Christian council of war, however, the Genoese finally proposed the employment of a testudo or penthouse on wheels (*eschaffault sur petites roues*), for which they said they had the component parts aboard their transports. When assembled, it would be three stories high. They would wheel the penthouse up to the port tower, which the Latin merchants then in Mahdia had contrived to inform them was the weak spot in the walls. The Genoese had also brought with them two huge grappling hooks called "falcon's beaks" (*becs de faulcon*) which they could attach to the roofs of two wooden structures with side walls to protect the flanks of fifteen men-at-arms and ten cross-bowmen as they mounted ladders to the tower. They would build these structures on four galleys, which would convey them to the port tower opposite their anchorage, "et si celle tour povons avoir, nous aurons tout!" The Genoese said that they needed only eight days to build these devices.

Observing the construction from day to day of the three-story tower or penthouse, the authorities in Mahdia confined the Latin mer-

chants to their dwellings. The Moslems concentrated their bombards at the port tower, and defended themselves (says Ibn-Khaldūn) with the certainty of a glorious recompense in the next world. They rained stones and arrows upon the besiegers, and shot powder and naphtha bolts at the tall penthouse, burning it completely in a night and a day, as the Genoese moved it slowly (too slowly, says the chronicler of S. Denis) toward the tower. The duke of Bourbon then ordered a great assault upon the three landward gates to divert some of the garrison from the tower, so that the falcon's beaks atop the fortifications on the galleys might be used with some hope of success. But the Moslems had already built over the port tower a strange scaffolding with slits in the floor, and as the Genoese reached the top, and stepped from the falcon's beaks to the slit flooring, the defenders slashed their feet to ribbons from underneath. The Christian attackers could neither see nor reach their assailants below them, and many Genoese leaped from the high tower into the sea below. "Thus," says Cabaret, "the assault with the falcon's beaks came to an end."

Meanwhile the duke of Bourbon, the nobles, and men-at-arms had assailed the landward walls "so fiercely that one of the gates was burned, but the many people who were within walled it up so that no one could enter." The three Saracen kings, says Cabaret, and the more than 46,000 men with them, only a bow-shot from the Christians attacking the city, allegedly did no more than shout encouragement to the defenders on the walls. The siege of Mahdia had failed, "and yet it was a wonderful thing," and Cabaret bears witness to the fact, "for Duke Louis of Bourbon and his company to attack such a strong and fine city on the sea as is 'Auffricque' despite the power of three Saracen kings, who began with 60,000 horse. . . ."⁵²

The siege had lasted some nine or ten weeks.⁵³

⁵² Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXVIII, pp. 238-42; *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 664, 666; Froissart, XIV, 249-50, 270 ff., on the discouragement of the French; Ibn-Khaldūn, *Histoire des berbères* . . . , trans. de Slane, III (Paris, 1934), 118. Cabaret obviously implies that almost 14,000 Moslem troopers had either been killed or had deserted during the siege. Comment on the Christian chroniclers' gross exaggeration of Moslem strength in almost all battles, sieges, and the like, is unnecessary at this point, but we shall have occasion to return to the subject.

⁵³ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXX, p. 248, "deux mois et demi;" *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 666, "decem et amplius

⁵⁰ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXVI, pp. 233-34.

⁵¹ Cabaret d' Orville, chap. LXXVII, pp. 235-38.

The Christian warriors had found the heat exhausting, and they seemed further from their objective than when they had first arrived. Men-at-arms were accustomed to fighting on horseback, and most of them found their armor too heavy for rapid movement on foot. Fresh water and food were in short supply; illness was rife in the camp; and physicians were clearly wanting in the host. The chroniclers attest to the grumbling, and men feared they might still be "devant Affrique" when the long, cold nights of winter came. The Moslem defenders of Mahdia were in their own country; the Christians were in an alien, hostile land. They remembered the storm which had dispersed their fleet in July, and quailed at the prospect of a wintry sea. Some even thought that the Genoese, "qui sont dures gens et traîtres," might board the galleys some night, sail off, and leave their erstwhile allies to pay the price of their common failure. If we may believe Froissart, the Genoese were already reproaching the French: "When we left Genoa, we hoped that after you got to Mahdia, you would have conquered the place in a week or two, but we have already been here more than two months, and still you have done nothing!"

The leaders agreed with the rank and file. They also wanted to go home. There were rumors that the Genoese were already preparing to betray the French and deliver them to the Moslems. Some of the crusaders wished to go on to Cyprus and Rhodes, and even to take "le chemin de Jhérusalem," but most of them boarded the galleys and transports with the strong desire to go back home, where their wives awaited them "en grant ennuy." Charles VI of France rejoiced in their safe return, says Froissart, and asked for news of Barbary and the expedition. In fact Charles is said to have told them:

If we can do so much as to bring about union in the Church and peace between ourselves and the English, we should gladly make a voyage overseas to exalt the Christian faith, confound the infidels, and clear the souls of our predecessors, King Philip of blessed memory and King John, our grandfather, for both . . . took the cross to go overseas to the Holy Land, and they would have gone

ebdomadarum spacio;" and Froissart, XIV, 231, 237, 274, who says that the Christians boarded their vessels to leave Mahdia on the sixty-first day of the siege.

if such terrible wars had not tied their hands. . . .⁵⁴

The contemporary chroniclers are often lively but rarely accurate, and Cabaret relied on the memory of old Jean de Châteaumorand. Cabaret tells us that it was the Genoese who wanted to give up the siege, and that they secured a commitment from the Moslems not to molest the Christians for ten years. He represents the duke of Bourbon as protesting that the crusaders had not come to Mahdia seeking an accord but action in the field. Nevertheless, the Genoese are said to have negotiated a "treaty," according to which the entire annual revenue which the king of Tunis derived from Mahdia should go to Genoa for fifteen years. The Tunisians should also pay "au duc et commun de Gennes" 25,000 ducats to defray the costs of the expedition. The Catalan, Neapolitan, and Sardinian merchants who lived in Mahdia were obliged to stand surety for the Tunisians' obligations. The duke of Bourbon called a council of war to discuss these terms, and a revered old warrior stated "that this was the most honorable position in which he had ever found himself, having warded off the power of three kings for two months and a half and having assailed their city in their very presence without their bringing relief, . . . which is a greater thing than the greatest battle that one could behold."

Cabaret, writing long after the event, thus rehearses the propaganda which in the months and years to come would seek to convert a dreary failure into a heroic success. When the old warrior asserted that the terms of the proposed treaty were as honorable "as if the city had been taken," one after the other the French and English lords solemnly agreed with him. The order was then given for the fleet to be made ready for departure in three days. The Christian rear-guard caught in ambush 600 *hommes à cheval* whom the Moslem kings sent to harass their withdrawal, and the duke of Bourbon with all the army went aboard the fleet "à son bel aise," sailing to the island of Conigliera, where the Genoese revealed that they had further plans for the crusade.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Froissart, XIV, 270-74, 279-80.

⁵⁵ Cabaret d'Orville, chap. LXXX, pp. 246-51, a questionable account; cf. *Religieux de Saint-Denys*, I, 670, and Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, p. 351, who both put the indemnity to be paid by the Tunisians at 10,000 ducats.

The Genoese admiral Giovanni Centurione suggested that, as the crusading fleet returned, it might occupy the Catalan port of Cagliari on the southern end of Sardinia, which he said was a supply depot for the kingdom of Tunis. Cabaret asserts that Louis of Bourbon had asked the Genoese to propose some further use of the fleet "sur les mescréans," and that he readily agreed to the attack upon Cagliari, where they found in the harbor "grosses naves qui furent princes par force d'armes." They easily took the castle as well as the lower town; the duke turned them over to the Genoese, making them swear not to ship foodstuffs to Tunis; "and the Genoese promised the duke that they would guard [the place] well and loyally for the Christians." Nearby was the small island of Ogliaastro (*Guillastre*), off the east coast of Sardinia, which according to Centurione sent even more supplies to the Moslems than Cagliari. The inhabitants of the island surrendered without a blow, and received a Genoese garrison with the assurance that no harm would come to them.

The next port of call was to be Naples, whose merchants were said also to ship supplies to Mahdia; the duke and the Genoese, says Cabaret, wanted to show the Neapolitans the treaty they had made with the Tunisians. They doubtless wanted to do more than that, but that night the worst storm broke out "that ever a Christian could see, and they thought all the galleys like to founder and the transports to sink." Most of the galleys made the harbor of Messina, although one was blown as far west as Trapani and suffered shipwreck, but without loss of life. The duke of Bourbon spent eight days at Messina, being royally entertained by Manfredo de Chiaramonte, "who in those days was the lord of Messina, Trapani, and Palermo, and of well over half the island of Sicily." The duke knighted Manfredo at the latter's request, and he and his companions received gifts of horses from their generous host, who also had wine, ship's biscuit, salted meats, and other provisions loaded aboard the fleet. When the duke asked the Genoese what their next move was to be, they were ready with the answer:

My lord, upon leaving here we shall go by sea, and you can arrive at a town . . . called Terracina, where there is a fine port on the sea, and the inhabitants there add to the strength of Mahdia with victuals neither more nor less than did the island of Sardinia. If you can do no better along

the way than to attack and destroy them, it still seems to us that it is a good idea to go there.

The naïveté of Cabaret's account would appear to be exceeded only by the duke of Bourbon's gullibility. The crusaders sailed to Terracina, took the lower town, and laid siege to the castle, which surrendered in two days to the duke, who turned it over to the Genoese on the same conditions that he had given them Cagliari and Ogliaastro. The fleet continued northward along the coast to Piombino, which was then under the control of Pietro Gambacorta, captain and lord of Pisa (1369–1392), whom Cabaret calls "a great gentleman." Gambacorta had been at war with the Genoese, and now they advocated his destruction. Although up to this point the only successes of the crusade lay in the reduction of Christian strongholds, the duke of Bourbon piously observed, "I have not come to make war on Christians, but if it is a matter of peace in which I may be useful, I will act willingly, and I shall summon him. You will state your case, and he will state his, and if some means of accord is found, I shall gladly do my duty." Gambacorta came to Piombino, according to Cabaret, both sides stated their grievances, and the duke and his council reconciled them in a just accord "as if they were brothers." Thereafter the fleet touched at the island of Elba, and went on to the Genoese landing stage at Portofino, where most of the host and (contrary to Cabaret) the duke himself came ashore sometime before 15 October, 1390. At Genoa a dozen Englishmen and a half-dozen French lords died, having finally succumbed to the rigors of the crusade and the return voyage.⁵⁶

The preliminary "treaty" or truce, which Cabaret describes (doubtless inaccurately) as having been negotiated before the crusaders raised the siege of Mahdia, was finally solemnized in the royal palace at Tunis on 17

⁵⁶ Cabaret d'Orville, chaps. LXXX–LXXXI, pp. 251–57; Mirot, *Rev. études hist.*, XCVII, 389–93; Atiya, *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 427–31. There is a gap of four years (1388–1392) in the chronicle of the well-informed Pisan merchant Ranieri Sardo (d. before 23 December, 1399), who from his vantage point of *anziano, camarlingo del comune*, etc., observed Pietro Gambacorta through the latter's entire public career (Ottavio Banti, ed., *Cronaca di Pisa di Ranieri Sardo*, Rome, 1963). Thus, unfortunately, Sardo sheds no light on Cabaret's doubtful account of Louis of Bourbon's high-minded adjudication at Piombino of the Genoese-Pisan conflict.

October, 1391, a full year after the return of the expedition to Genoa. Without mention of Cabaret's "treaty," the new *pax et concordia* confirmed an earlier (non-extant) Genoese-Tunisian treaty of 18 August, 1383. According to the Latin and Arabic texts, Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad II was to release all Genoese captives for the sum of 16,000 double dinars (*doblae*), which the Genoese envoys agreed to pay "without any other charge or expense."⁵⁷ The Tunisians regarded the crusaders' abandonment of the siege as a Moslem victory, which indeed it was, and Ibn-Khaldūn has noted that "Allah repulsed the [Christian] unbelievers; they departed in a fury of frustration, and obtained no advantage: Allah spared the Moslems even the pain of combat."⁵⁸

Froissart declares that after the siege the Saracens tightened their defense against the Genoese and the French, and resolved that henceforth neither Genoese nor Venetians should pass through the straits of Gibraltar, *l'estroit de Maroch*, to take their merchandise to Flanders "without paying so great a tribute [*treü*] that all would be amazed, and [their passage] would still be by grace and leave." Banding together, the rulers of the Berber kingdoms put armed galleys to sea in large numbers "pour estre seigneurs et maistres de la mer," moved by the hatred they now felt for the French and Genoese because of the siege of Mahdia. The result was, according to Froissart, "that all merchandise which came from Damascus, Cairo, Alexandria, Venice, Naples, and Genoa became for a while so scarce that several items could not be got for gold or silver, and all spices became fearfully expensive."⁵⁹

⁵⁷ L. de Mas Latrie, *Traité de paix et de commerce* . . . , II (1866, repr. 1965), pt. IV, no. XIV, pp. 130-32, and *cf.*, *ibid.*, I, 243, and Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale*, I (1940), 203. According to a report of the Venetian envoy Giacomo Vallaresso, dated at Tunis on 5 July, 1392, the Tunisians held 260 Genoese prisoners at this time (Mas Latrie, I, 245-46, and II, 240).

⁵⁸ Ibn-Khaldūn, *Histoire des berbères* . . . , trans. de Slane, III (Paris, 1934), 119.

⁵⁹ Froissart, XIV, 278. Mirot, *Rev. études hist.*, XCVII, 394-95, doubts Froissart's statement; Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale*, I, 202, accepts it. Insofar as the Berber kings became "maistres de la mer," it was the result of their encouraging piracy and harboring corsairs. There is ample evidence for the scarcity of spices in Europe after Peter of Lusignan's sack of Alexandria in 1365, but the Venetian Misti and other sources bear witness to a revival of the spice trade from the 1370's. Despite the internecine strife which disrupted the political life of Mamluk Egypt and Syria after

Whatever the truth of Froissart's assertion, after the Genoese had made peace with Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad II, the Venetian envoy and consul Giacomo Vallaresso gained a ten years' confirmation of an old Veneto-Tunisian commercial treaty, which had apparently been in force since 1317. Vallaresso was well received at the royal court in Tunis, and the long letter which he wrote the Doge Antonio Venier on 5 July, 1392, the day after the ratification of the treaty, contains a remarkable description of procedures at the court. The treaty was typical of such commercial *instrumenta*, granting the Venetians their own fondaco, church, and oven in Tunis, as well as extraterritorial rights of jurisdiction under their own consul, together with the solemn guarantee of protection *in personis et rebus suis*. Aḥmad II even paid for the ransom of thirty-five Venetian captives who were found at Tunis and Bona.⁶⁰

It took the Pisans much longer to restore friendly relations with Tunis, for in 1388 (as we have seen) Pisan galleys had joined in Manfredo de Chiaramonte's attack upon Jerba and the other islands in the Gulf of Gabes. The republic of Pisa claimed that the state had played no part in the anti-Moslem league, but merely that shipowners had privately leased their galleys to Chiaramonte. At length, by the "peace, conventions, and pacts" of 14 December, 1397, Aḥmad II's son and successor, Abū-Fāris 'Abd-al-'Azīz II (1394-1434), acceded to the restoration of the Pisans' consular rights, fondachi, ready access to provisions for their galleys and ships, and the customary ten per cent duty on imports sold in Tunisia. Pisans were to refrain absolutely from piracy, and the "Saracens" were to assist them in suppressing

1382, the international spice trade is said to have fared well (*cf.* I. M. Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Mass., 1967, pp. 26, 30). In general see W. J. Fischel, "The Spice Trade in Mamluk Egypt," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, I (1957-58), 157-74, and especially Gaston Wiet, "Les Marchands d'épices sous les sultans mamlouks," *Cahiers d'histoire égyptienne*, VII-2 (1955), 81-147, who sheds a good deal of light on the eastern scene, but says little of the Mamluks' economic relations with the European states. The reader will find informed and impartial criticism of much relevant scholarly work in Eliyahu Ashtor, "Recent Research in Levantine Trade," in *The Journal of European Economic History*, II-1 (Rome, 1973), 187-206.

⁶⁰ Mas Latrie, *Traité de paix*, I, 244-49, and II, pt. VII, nos. XII-XIV, pp. 232-43; R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, III (Venice, 1883), bk. VIII, nos. 381-83, pp. 215-16.

the *corsales* who had become the scourge of the sea.⁶¹

As for the Sicilians, their island kingdom was torn by internal dissension caused partly by the rivalries of the Catalan and native factions, whose interests conflicted, and whose hostilities were exacerbated by cultural differences. Chiaramonte did not hold Jerba very long, but Don Martin I, Catalan king of Sicily, never relaxed his claim to the islands in the Gulf of Gabes. Numerous unsuccessful efforts were made to arrange a peace with the Moslems, ransom captives, and resume commercial relations. A formal peace (*pax*), in fact, seems to have been put off from decade to decade, although various truces (*treguae*) were finally arranged. Since both sides sought much the same objectives, amicable relations were often achieved for years at a time.⁶²

Upon their return to France the crusaders seemed to find again the enthusiasm for warfare against the infidel which had been much diminished by their failure under the walls of Mahdia. The poets reflected the mentality of the age. The legends of the "Table Ronde" glorified adventure, combat, and warfare, fidelity, honor, and chivalry, and one believed quite as much in the *croisade* as in *amour courtois*. The amiable Froissart, who loved the English, and the embittered Eustache Deschamps, who hated them, both approved of the Barbary crusade. One read Guillaume de Machaut, whom Deschamps called his master; both Deschamps and Christine de Pisan paid tribute to Louis II of Bourbon. In Paris, Charles VI, to whom portions of Mézières' *Songe du vieil pèlerin* were probably being read at this very time, said that his thoughts were turned night and day toward the crusade, and of course there were those who encouraged him to think "of going overseas against the Saracens and of conquering the Holy Land." But there were also those who urged him first to go to Rome and drive the "anti-pope" Boniface IX from St. Peter's throne, and Charles said that he would consider doing so, according to Froissart, for he was much drawn to Clement VII, "because during the past year he had been in Avignon, where the pope

and the cardinals had honored him exceedingly, and had given him, his brother, and his uncles more than he had asked of them."⁶³

Popular reaction to great events may be baffling to the historian, but people tend to believe what they want. Froissart clearly thought that Enguerrand VII de Coucy had a wiser head than Louis of Bourbon.⁶⁴ We have already seen, however, that Cabaret, writing in 1429, repeats what seems to have become the popular assessment of Louis's crusade: to have warded off the power of three Moslem kings for ten weeks, laid siege to Mahdia under their very eyes, and overawed them to the point they dared not risk combat to relieve the city—it was in short "a greater thing than the greatest battle" that one could ever hope to witness. Although most crusading expeditions transformed allies into enemies, the French response to the Genoese appeal for assistance against Tunisian piracy apparently endeared Charles VI to the *popolo minuto*, among whom the Doge Antoniotto Adorno found his chief support. Factional strife in Genoa had reached the point of chaos. After a stormy career which had included frequent flight and deposition, Adorno "decided to give the city to the king of France,"⁶⁵ who accepted the offer, and thus acquired Genoa in the fall of 1396 despite the objections of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, who had been anxious to add the important seaport to his own domains. Adorno gave up the ducal office, and ruled briefly as governor until the French took over.⁶⁶ Later Jean II Le Meingre, better known as the Marshal Boucicaut, served as the king's governor in Genoa, where he did very much as he chose during his eight years' tenure (from October, 1401, to June, 1409). In his dedication to the crusade the headstrong Boucicaut was the military counterpart to the publicist Philippe de Mézières, whose *Songe du vieil pèlerin* and other works certainly carried much weight with him. In 1399 Boucicaut led the first of his two extraordinary expeditions into the East,

⁶³ Froissart, XIV, 280–81.

⁶⁴ Cf. Froissart, XIV, 244–51, and Mas Latrie, *Traité de paix* . . . , I, 242.

⁶⁵ Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, bk. IX, p. 368.

⁶⁶ The facts are well known, and so is the excellent study of Eugène Jarry, *Les Origines de la domination française à Gênes (1392–1402)*, Paris, 1896, esp. chaps. VII–X, and see Michel de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie: La France et l'Italie au temps du Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1936, pp. 167–209, for a succinct account of events in Genoa from 1393 to 1396.

⁶¹ Mas Latrie, *Traité de paix*, I, 243–44, and II, pt. II, no. xvii, pp. 70–87. The treaty was negotiated in the name of Jacopo d' Appiano, who had replaced Gambacorta as captain of Pisa.

⁶² Mas Latrie, *Traité de paix*, I, 249–51, and II, pt. V, nos. xi–xxviii, pp. 161–81, docs. dated from 1392 to 1479.

with Cabaret's old friend Jean de Châteaumorand as his chief lieutenant, to relieve the Turkish pressure on impoverished Constantinople.

Soldiers, merchants, and pilgrims brought strange tidings back from the distant East, and the credulous at all levels of society gave each new rumor some measure of belief as it spread through castles as well as taverns. As Turkish domination was extended over ever wider areas in the Balkans, the eyes of Europe were turned to the Ottoman court at Adrianople. Although the formidable Murad I had been killed on the battlefield at Kossovo in June, 1389, his able son Bayazid I succeeded him as emir, and planned still further conquests. Froissart, who does not distinguish very clearly between father and son, reports that the sultan "Basaach dit l'Amorath-Bacquin" threatened King Sigismund of Hungary "that he would come to fight him in the midst of the latter's own country, and he would ride on so far as to reach Rome, and he would feed his horse oats on the altar of S. Peter's at Rome." Bayazid intended to establish his *siège impérial* on the banks of the Tiber, and he would bring with him in his suite the emperor of Constantinople and all the great barons of Greece. He would, to be sure, allow everyone to live according to his own laws, for he wanted no more than the [imperial] title and sovereignty. But that was quite enough for Sigismund, who entreated Charles VI to make the menacing news known throughout the kingdom of France so that knights and squires might be moved to come to the aid of the Hungarians and prevent Christendom from being trampled underfoot.⁶⁷

According to the chronicler of S. Denis, Bayazid's spies and interpreters kept him well informed concerning the kings and kingdoms of Christendom, "and extolling the king of France above all [others], he is said to have told Frenchmen many times that, when he had finished what he had begun in Hungary and neighboring regions, he intended to pay him a visit for sure." His words are said to have made but slight impression at the French court, however, where Charles VI is quoted as stating in reply, "Would to God that the occasion

might present itself that I could meet him in single combat!"⁶⁸

Whether Murad or Bayazid ever spoke with such boastful assurance of their plans for westward conquest is less important than the fact that many Europeans believed that they had done so. Bayazid's ambition was certainly to be feared. In 1390 he had conducted two victorious campaigns in Asia Minor, in the course of which he had occupied the last Byzantine city in the great peninsula, Philadelphia,⁶⁹ which (as we have seen) had offered itself to the papacy almost forty years before. In these campaigns he had also effected the conquest of the emirates of Sarukhan, Aydin, Monteshe, Hamid, and Germiyan. Bayazid had thus come to control the whole west coast of Asia Minor with the exception of Smyrna, which still remained in Christian hands under the protection of the Hospitallers. He was already the master of Serbia and Bulgaria, and in April, 1394, he reoccupied Thessalonica, of which the Byzantines had managed a brief repossession. He drew a cordon around Constantinople, and held the city in a tight blockade. Some sixty years later the historian Ducas represents Bayazid as informing the Emperor Manuel II, "If you do not want to do and allow whatever I command, keep fast the gates of the city and rule in its midst, for all the lands outside it are mine!"⁷⁰

Although Mircea the Elder, voivode of Wallachia, fought the Turks to a standstill in the bloody battle of Rovine (on 17 May, 1395), he had to pay tribute, and Ottoman forces soon occupied the Dobruja.⁷¹ In fact the Ottomans were now moving back and forth across the Danube at will, and it is small wonder that King Sigismund of Hungary sent

⁶⁸ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, I, 708, 710, where the sultan "Lamorat-Baxin" is said to be a ruler of integrity, anxious to extend his fame by force of arms, but humane in victory, tolerant of those who paid him tribute, and steadfast in observing the treaties and promises he had made.

⁶⁹ Laonicus Chalcocondylas, *Hist.*, II (Bonn, p. 64); Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Montesche, Studien zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jahrh.*, Istanbul, 1934, pp. 78 ff.; Peter Charanis, "The Strife among the Palaeologi and the Ottoman Turks, 1370-1402," *Byzantion*, XVI (1942-43), 304-6.

⁷⁰ Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chap. 13 (Bonn, p. 49); Franz Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien* (1944), pp. 8-9.

⁷¹ G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 489-90, and cf. Halil Inalcik, "The Emergence of the Ottomans," in P. M. Holt, A. K. S. Lambton, and B. Lewis, eds., *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I (1970), 277-78.

⁶⁷ Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., *Œuvres de Froissart, Chroniques*, XV (Brussels, 1871), 216-17.

letters and envoys to the European princes soliciting their help to stop the infidel advance. The success of his appeal was to lead to the campaign which the Turks would stop at Nicopolis, perhaps the greatest disaster ever suffered by Christian forces in the long history of the crusades.⁷³

The popes had lost the leadership of the crusades to the princes, owing to the tragic contest for spiritual supremacy which the rival pontiffs carried on with each other during the years of the Great Schism (1378–1417).⁷³ Boni-

⁷³ There is a succinct survey of the sources relating to the crusade of Nicopolis in Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient* (1886), I, 211–19, who provides a reliable general account of the expedition (*ibid.*, I, 220–320) as well as a collection of pertinent documents (II, nos. v ff., pp. 18 ff.). See also the monograph of A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade of Nicopolis*, London, 1934, and *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (1938), pp. 435–62; R. Rosetti, "Notes on the Battle of Nicopolis (1396)," *The Slavonic (and East European) Review*, XV (1936–37), 629–38; H. L. Savage, "Enguerrand de Coucy VII and the Campaign of Nicopolis," *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 423–42; Charles L. Tipton, "The English at Nicopolis," *Speculum*, XXXVII (1962), 528–40; and Richard Vaughan, *Philip The Bold*, Cambridge, Mass., 1962, pp. 62–78.

Of the relevant older literature, in addition to Delaville Le Roulx, mention should be made of the brief but densely packed dissertation of Alois Brauner, *Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis* (1396), Breslau, 1876; the study of the Prussian general G. Köhler, *Die Schlachten von Nicopoli und Warna*, Breslau, 1882; Ferdinand von Šišić, "Die Schlacht bei Nicopolis (25. September 1396)," in the *Wissenschaftliche Mittheilungen aus Bosnien und der Hercegovina*, VI (Vienna, 1899), 291–327; and Max Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem zur Zeit der Entstehung des türkischen Reiches nach venezianischen Quellen*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1923, pp. 97 ff.

⁷⁴ However superfluously, perhaps attention should be called to Noel Valois's well-known work on *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, 4 vols., Paris, 1896–1902, repr. Hildesheim, 1967, as well as Édouard Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, vol. I (1933), and Michel de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie: La France et l'Italie au temps du Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1936; and in the present context special mention should be made of the article by Oskar Halecki, "Rome et Byzance au temps du Grand Schisme d'Occident," *Collectanea theologica*, XVIII (Lwów, 1937), 477–532. A number of anti-Turkish bulls addressed to lay and ecclesiastical authorities in Hungary, Poland, the Balkans, and Constantinople as well as in Armenia and Georgia may be found in A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Urbani PP. VI (1378–1389), Bonifacii PP. IX (1389–1404), Innocentii PP. VII (1404–1406) et Gregorii PP. XI (1406–1415)*, Rome, 1970, nos. 24, 32, 33a, 55, 58, 61–62, 82, 85, and 90, docs. dated from April, 1391, to May, 1400 (Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, Fontes, ser. III, vol. XIII, tom. I). Most of the texts published by Tăutu relate to matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The events which led to the cardinals' revolt against Urban VI and to the election of Clement VII are vividly depicted in Walter Ullmann's little book on *The Origins of the Great Schism*, London, 1948;

face IX, who held the Roman see, retained for the most part the allegiance of Hungary, the German states, England, Italy, and Poland, while the Avignonese pope, Clement VII, was recognized in France, the Spanish kingdoms, Naples, and Sicily. Boniface was supporting the claims of young Ladislas, son of Charles III of Durazzo, against the efforts of the "schismatic" Louis II of Anjou to hold the kingdom of Naples. Louis had been receiving such help as could be provided by Clement VII, who died on 16 September, 1394. From Rome on 3 June (1394) Boniface IX sent the Dominican Giovanni de Montelupone, bishop of Naupactus (Lepanto), as papal nuncio into Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Serbia (*Slavonia*) to arouse the Slavic princelings against his rival Clement's followers in the south Italian kingdom. But at the same time Boniface wrote the good bishop of Naupactus, lamenting the recent Turkish attacks upon the "kingdoms" of Hungary, Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Serbia, the principality of Achaëa, the duchy of Athens, "and some other Christian possessions," including doubtless those of the Venetians at Negroponte and in the Aegean. The Turks tortured and killed their Christian captives, sold them into slavery, and forced them to abjure their faith—*horret animus talia reminisci!* Giovanni was therefore ordered to preach the crusade against the Turks and to offer the usual rewards of indulgence to all who accepted at his hands the *venerabile signum crucis*.⁷⁴

During the summer King Sigismund sent an embassy to Venice, and on 6 September (1394) the Senate took solemn note of the fact "that because of the Turkish invasions of his kingdom [the king] himself has decided . . . to move next May with a powerful army . . .

he also explores the rocky route by which the cardinals' oligarchical ambitions finally led Christendom, contrary to their intentions, to the popular doctrine of conciliarism.

⁷⁴ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1394, nos. 20, 23, vol. VII (Lucca, 1752), pp. 583, 584b–585; cf. C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, I (1913, repr. 1960), 362, who makes Giovanni de Montelupone a Franciscan. Alois Brauner, *Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, diss. Breslau, 1876, pp. 8–9, erroneously identified him as archbishop of Neopatra; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 228, repeats the error (without identifying Montelupone by name); and Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 33, and *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, p. 435, note 2, follows them in the same mistake, which occurs also in Halecki, *Collectanea theologica*, XVIII, 498–500. Cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatra: Regestes et documents pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des duchés catalans (1311–1395)," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXVIII (1958), no. 249, pp. 81–82.

against the said Turks to their loss and destruction, and that therefore he requests us to give him counsel, assistance, and good will. . . ." The Senate was full of good will, and was sure that Sigismund and his advisers had given wise consideration to the step which he proposed to take. The Venetians would be much distressed if Sigismund and his subjects should suffer any misfortune, especially at the hands of the "infidel persecutors of the Catholic faith." They hoped God would crown his efforts with "glory and triumph," and then bestow peace and tranquillity upon his people. As for assistance, however, when the other *principes et communitates mundi* were prepared to render all the help they could, his Majesty would find the Venetians ready to do so also, "as our commune has always been accustomed to do in similar emergencies."⁷⁵

The following month, on 15 and 30 October (1394), Pope Boniface IX again issued anti-Turkish bulls, appointing another Dominican, Gian Domenico of Gubbio, to preach the crusade in Venetian territory as well as in Austria, the archbishopric of Salzburg, Treviso, and the patriarchate of Grado. According to the pope, the Turks had already occupied parts of Hungary, and had imposed such daily burdens on the Hungarians that they were now worse off than the Israelites had been under the yoke of Pharaonic servitude.⁷⁶ There was widespread discussion of a Christian league against the Turks, and Boniface was doing what he could to promote it. On 23 December there was a Byzantine envoy in Venice. He had obviously been there for some time, but the Senate postponed consideration of his requests, "because embassies are expected here from France, Burgundy, England, and Hungary also."⁷⁷

Immediately thereafter Guillaume de la Trémoille, the marshal of Burgundy, did arrive in Venice as the envoy of Duke Philip the Bold, who had sent him first to Hungary.

Guillaume had expected another Hungarian embassy, headed by John de Kanizsa, archbishop of Gran (Esztergom), to arrive on the lagoon by Epiphany (6 January, 1395). They had agreed upon the date, Guillaume told the Senate, while he was in Hungary. Wishing to wait no longer, the impatient marshal appeared before the Senate on 21 January, and explained the intention of the dukes of Burgundy, Orléans, and Lancaster to go on the crusade for the relief of Hungary, *ad pium opus et passagium*. The Senate tried to persuade Guillaume to await the Hungarians' arrival so that, having heard all the embassies on their way to Venice, "we might be able with fuller and clearer deliberation to reply to all the requests being made of us."⁷⁸ He did wait two more weeks, and since the Hungarians had still not come, Guillaume left Venice to return to the Burgundian court (on 4 February, 1395).⁷⁹

About a month later John de Kanizsa finally arrived with the other members of the Hungarian embassy, and informed a delegation of nobles which the Senate had sent to receive them that their mission was taking them *ad diversas mundi partes*, but first of all to Venice. They proposed to speak frankly, and to reveal Sigismund's *secreta cordis*. Archbishop of Gran, member of a great feudal family, a powerful personality, John de Kanizsa could speak with authority for his king. He said that Sigismund was determined to employ his full resources against the Turks. On 5 March (1395) the Senate authorized the Collegio to deal with the Hungarians, and in the negotiations which followed, Kanizsa apparently outlined the king's plans for the crusade. There was agreement that at least twenty-five galleys would be required to prevent the Turks from moving

⁷⁵ Sime Ljubić, ed., *Listine*, in *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, IV (Zagreb, 1874), no. CCCCLXXVI, pp. 335–36, and Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, in *Monumenta Hungariae historica, Acta externa*, III (Budapest, 1876), no. 473, pp. 755–56.

⁷⁶ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1394, nos. 24–25, vol. VII (1752), pp. 585–86. On 17 January, 1395, however, the Senate forbade Gian Domenico to preach the crusade "in our city" for fear of Turkish reprisals (Halecki, *Collectanea theologica*, XVIII, 501–4).

⁷⁷ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CCCCLXXXII, p. 338, and Wenzel, *MHH, Acta externa*, III, no. 474, p. 757.

⁷⁸ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CCCCLXXXIII, p. 338, and Wenzel, *MHH, Acta externa*, III, no. 475, pp. 757–58. John de Kanizsa (*de Kanysa*), archbishop of Gran (*Strigonia*), primate and *legatus natus* of Hungary and royal chancellor, died on 30 May, 1418, according to Eubel, I, 465. Although he is very well known from scores of contemporary documents (György [Georgius] Fejér, ed., *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, tom. X, vol. II [Buda, 1834], nos. XL, XLV, XLVII, etc., CCVIII, CCXIV, CCXVII, CCXXIII, CCXXXVIII, *et alibi*), Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 14–15, calls him Nicholas, and leads Delaville Le Roulx and Atiya into error. To add to the confusion Brauner, p. 48, also correctly refers to him as John. Nicholas de Kanizsa was a lay lord (*miles*), and John's brother (Fejér, *ibid.*, X-2, nos. CXIII, CCLII, pp. 207, 447, 450). On the primacy of the archbishopric of Gran in Hungary, see *ibid.*, no. CCLXXX, pp. 508 ff.

⁷⁹ Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 229–30.

"into Turkey from Greece and back again," and the galleys would cost from 35,000 to 40,000 ducats a month. (The maintenance of an armed galley amounted to about 1,500 ducats a month.) Kanizsa and his companions insisted upon knowing, before they left Venice, what part of this fleet the Republic would contribute.

The Senate reminded them on 10 March that Venice was at peace with the Turks; there were many Venetian merchants in Ottoman territories, where they were being well treated; and the Republic's overseas possessions were exposed to Turkish attack on a wide front.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, when the king of Hungary actually began his campaign against the Turks, along with the dukes of Burgundy, Orléans, and Lancaster, to whom the ambassadors would soon be going, Venice would provide one-fourth of a fleet not exceeding twenty-five galleys—that is, Venice would provide six galleys. If the fleet consisted of only twenty galleys, the Venetian contingent would be five, etc., and they would be kept in service as long as the other states or princes contributing to the fleet kept theirs in service, and as long as Sigismund and the three dukes remained in the field against the Turks.

On 11 March the Signoria reported the Senate's decision to the ambassadors, who now asked whether Venice would still make her galleys available for the crusade if the "princes and dukes of France and England" decided not to join the expedition, because the king of Hungary might be determined to go it alone with God's help. The next day, the twelfth, the Senate replied that the Venetian galleys would join a crusading fleet on the terms which had been stated the day before. The king of Hungary ought not to attempt the campaign without the support of the other princes, and as for the Venetians, the Senate foresaw that their participation in such a risky venture could well bring *multa pericula et manifestissima damna* upon their citizens, merchants, and overseas possessions.⁸¹ If the princes of

France and England remained aloof, but Sigismund had the active support of the king of Poland, the ruler of Bosnia, the duke of Austria, and others whom the Senate might insist on, galleys might well be provided to such extent as would be in keeping with the honor of the Church and of the Republic as well as with the requirements of the crusade.⁸²

John de Kanizsa and his fellow ambassadors had done the best they could. The Venetian offer was not unreasonable; no help could be expected from Genoa, for the city was in political chaos. If the Hungarians were going to have the support of a fleet, it appeared that the remaining galleys would have to be supplied by the French and the English. The ambassadors went on to France, where Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy, received them at Lyon (on 8 May, 1395), after which they paid their respects to the duke's wife Margaret, the heiress of Flanders, to whom they were presented at Dijon (on 17–19 May). In Bordeaux they waited upon John of Gaunt, the duke of Lancaster, to whom the Venetians had made frequent reference. On 6 August they arrived in Paris, where they met Philip again as well as the king's uncles; ushered into the royal presence, they gave Charles VI letters from Sigismund. John de Kanizsa addressed a spirited appeal to the throne, imploring Charles to come to the aid of the Hungarians lest they fall under the Turkish yoke like the unfortunate Serbs and Bulgarians.

At this juncture, according to the unknown but contemporary biographer of Marshal Boucicaut, the king of Hungary sent a herald to his friend Philippe d' Artois, count of Eu, with the news "that Bayazid was marching against him into his country with a full 40,000 Saracens, of whom 10,000 were horsemen." Sigismund had decided to do battle. He wanted Philippe d' Artois, who had been appointed constable of France in November, 1393, to inform Boucicaut of the danger threatening Hungary and to make the fact known also "à tous bons chevaliers et escuyers" who wished to increase their honor and display their valor by defending Christendom against the infidels. Boucicaut promptly announced that he

⁸⁰ In May, 1390, the new ruler, Bayazid, had confirmed the privileges previously accorded to the Venetians by the emirs of "Palatia and Altoluogo" (on the sites of ancient Miletus and Ephesus), allowing all traders from Venice, Candia, Negroponte, and Coron the right to trade safely in his domains (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III [1883], bk. VIII, nos. 341–42, 346, pp. 206–7).

⁸¹ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. CCCCLXXXVI–CCCCLXXXVIII, pp. 339–43, and Wenzel, *MHH, Acta externa*, III, nos. 477–78, pp. 760–63.

⁸² Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. CCCCLXXXVIII, p. 343, not in Wenzel, who unfortunately omits portions of the documents, sometimes for reasons best known to himself. Cf. F. von Šišić, "Schlacht bei Nicopolis," *Wissensch. Mitt. aus Bosnien und der Hercegovina*, VI, 303–4.

would go to Hungary, for he desired nothing more than to fight the "Saracens," and he remembered with gratitude Sigismund's hospitality on the occasion of his visit to Hungary (in 1388). The news spread everywhere, and the young John, count of Nevers, *qui estoit en fleur de grand jeunesse*, responded with a passionate desire to go, and received permission to do so from his august father, the duke of Burgundy.

The plight of Hungary was bruited throughout the realm,

and several young lords of royal blood as well as other barons and nobles wanted to go there to free themselves of idleness and to employ their time and strength in deeds of chivalry, for it seemed to them, and it was true, that they could not go on a more honorable expedition [*voyage*] or one more pleasing to God. Thus all France was caught up in this affair. . . . Of the principal participants in the enterprise we shall give the names, and the number of the French. First and foremost of all was the count of Nevers, who is now the duke of Burgundy [which title he held from April, 1404, to his death in September, 1419], first cousin of the king of France; milords Henri and Philippe de Bar, brothers and first cousins of the king; [Jacques de Bourbon,] the count of La Marche, and [Philippe d' Artois,] the count of Eu and constable, cousins of the king. Among the barons were [Enguerrand VII,] the lord of Coucy; Marshal Boucicaut; the lords [Guy and Guillaume] de la Trémoille; messire Jean de Vienne, admiral of France; [Jean de Hangest,] the lord of Heugleville; and many other knights and squires, the very flower of chivalry and nobility, a full thousand from the realm of France. . . . Marshal Boucicaut led seventy gentlemen at his own expense, and fifteen of these knights were his own relatives.⁸³

A full thousand knights and squires presumably meant a fighting force of some 4,000 to 5,000 men, for the rank and file of attendants and servants might serve as soldiers on the field. We shall come presently to the question of the probable numbers of Christian and Moslem combatants in the impending battle of Nicopolis.

⁸³ *Livre des faits du bon messire Jean le Maingre, dit Boucicaut*, pt. 1, chap. XXI, in J. A. C. Buchon, ed., *Les Chroniques de Sire Jean Froissart*, III (Paris, 1840), 589-90; the "livre des faits" may also be found in J. F. Michaud and J. J. F. Poujoulat, eds., *Nouvelle Collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, II (1850), the passage in question appearing in part 1 of Boucicaut's biography, chap. XXII, p. 236b. Cf. Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 231-32, 234-35, and von Šišić, in *Wissensch. Mitt. aus Bosnien*, VI, 304.

Having given his son John of Nevers permission to go on the crusade, Philip the Bold contrived to make him leader of the host. The atmosphere was charged with excitement, and the populace entertained exalted hopes. After defeating Bayazid and ridding Hungary of the infidels, says Froissart, "the Christians would go to Constantinople, pass beyond the 'arm of S. George,' and enter Syria; they would free the Holy Land and deliver Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulcher from the pagans and from subjection to the soldan and the enemies of our Lord." The Hungarian ambassadors had cause for satisfaction in the extraordinary success of their mission. They hastened back to Hungary with "ces bonnes nouvelles," and Sigismund rejoiced.⁸⁴

In Avignon, Pope Benedict XIII granted John of Nevers and the crusaders the usual indulgences and various special privileges, and Duke Philip decked out his son's company with ostentatious grandeur. Banners, pennons, and bannerets on lances were embroidered in gold and silver. The little flags attached to trumpets and even the saddle cloths were trimmed with silver braid and embroidered with the colors of Burgundy. There were tents and pavilions in heavy satin of bright green, John of Nevers's chosen color, so many of them in fact that it required twenty-four carts to carry them. John was himself to be attended by 133 valets clad in livery of "verd gay" embroidered in gold and silver thread. Four great banners were prepared with the image of the Virgin in gold, surrounded by *fleurs de lys* and the arms of Nevers. Three hundred small pennons and twenty-five large ones shone with silver; John's name was inscribed on them, as on six great standards, where the lettering was in gold. Froissart assures us "que . . . riens n' estoit espargnié,"⁸⁵ except perhaps the exercise of common sense, for such preparations were

⁸⁴ Froissart, XV, 218-20. Like the author of the *Livre des faits*, Froissart says that the French contingent numbered "à tout mille chevalliers et escuiers tous vaillans hommes" (*ibid.*, XV, 221, 230). The chronicler of S. Denis states that of the innumerable knights and squires who wanted to go with John of Nevers into Hungary, the latter "chose only two thousand," *ex his tamen solum duo milia elegit* (L. Bellaguet, ed., *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denis*, II [Paris, 1840], 428).

⁸⁵ Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, p. 18; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 238; Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp. 40, 141; Froissart, XV, 224.

better adapted to a coronation or a royal wedding than a campaign against the Turks.

Philip of Burgundy had been trying to assess his income for the projected *voyage* into Hungary ever since January, 1395. Counting the very heavy "aids which milord the duke plans to levy on his lands;" 80,000 francs which Charles VI owed him together with the 36,000 he would receive in the next nine months as a pension from the crown; a loan of 50,000 from Gian Galeazzo Visconti; and another 50,000 which Charles VI was expected to make "en don pour le voyage," Philip's accountant envisaged the possibility of raising 520,000 francs.⁸⁶ Considering the way the Burgundians were spending their money, it was not going to be enough, and further loans, some of them quite small, were later sought from various sources.⁸⁷ Fourteen months later (on 28 March, 1396) Philip issued an *ordonnance* at Paris, providing for a council of war to advise the young John of Nevers, enacting a few simple measures for the maintenance of discipline in the army, and giving the names of high nobles and knights "whom milord has enjoined to go on the 'voyage' to Hungary in company with milord of Nevers." According to these regulations, "a gentleman causing tumult loses his horse and armor [*cheval et harnois*]; and a varlet who wields a knife loses a hand, and if he steals he loses an ear." The host was to assemble at Dijon on 20 April to receive pay, and to be ready ten days later to embark upon the expedition from Montbéliard.⁸⁸

The French were to bear the brunt of the expedition although of course they would be joined by a sizable force of Hungarians under Sigismund as well as by a fair number of Germans and (until the battle) of Vlachs. There was also likely to be a sprinkling of Hospitalers, Poles, Italians, Bohemians, and unemployed *routiers* (sometimes called "Engleis"). Sigismund was in close touch with the Emperor Manuel II, who had sent an envoy to Hungary; the envoy, one Manuel Philotrophinus, was ex-

pected at Pola toward the end of February, 1396, and the Venetian Senate was prepared to speed his return to Constantinople. By 1 March the Senate knew the results of the Byzantine mission to Hungary. Philotrophinus told them that Sigismund had promised to have a "powerful army" on the Danube at a place called "Ulnavi" the following May, and to reach the shores of the Bosphorus in June. Manuel was to arm ten galleys for a month at the expense of Sigismund, who had already arranged for the payment of 30,000 ducats to Philotrophinus while the latter was in Venice. The Byzantine envoy advised the Venetians to cancel their plans to send an embassy to Bayazid in an effort to get him to make peace with Manuel II—the Turks were laying rather desultory siege to Constantinople—for such a peace would now be inconsistent with Manuel's entente with the Hungarians. The Senate decided to send an envoy to Constantinople to explain that they were indeed canceling their plans for an embassy to Bayazid. They were delighted with the results of Philotrophinus's embassy to Hungary, and hoped for the salvation and success of the Byzantine empire and its emperor.⁸⁹

There were limits, however, to the risks which Venice was prepared to take to help achieve that salvation and success. On 14 April, 1396, the Senate informed a Hungarian envoy that they were pleased to learn Sigismund would be on the march against the Turks by the feast of Pentecost (21 May), but they reminded the envoy that the dukes of Burgundy, Orléans, and Lancaster were apparently not going on the crusade. Although their participation had been the prime condition for the dispatch of Venetian galleys to the Bosphorus, the Senate did consent to send four well-armed galleys, which would arrive *in partibus Romanie* by mid-July, and would await Sigismund's arrival until mid-August. The Senate was certain that he would arrive "in those parts" before the time specified. After two days of debate and a dozen votes, however, the Senate finally decided that they could not make

⁸⁶ The text is given in Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, II, no. v, pp. 18–20, where it seems to me the precise figure should be 526,730 francs if the document has been correctly transcribed.

⁸⁷ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. vi, pp. 21–24.

⁸⁸ Dom Urban Planchet, *Histoire générale et particulière de Bourgogne*, 4 vols., Dijon, 1739–81, III, no. CLXX, pp. clxxiii–clxxv, cited (among others) by Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 18–22; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 235–38; and Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp. 41–42, 144–48.

⁸⁹ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. DVIII–DX, pp. 359–61, docs. dated 27 February and 1 March, 1396. The envoy's name appears in the documents as Hemanuel Philotropinus and Filatropinus (Misti, Reg. 43, fols. 113^v, 117^r). Since Sigismund was the ally of the Teutonic Knights, there were probably not many Polish recruits for the Nicopolis crusade (cf. O. Halecki, "La Pologne et l'empire byzantin," *Byzantion*, VII [1932], esp. pp. 47–50).

Sigismund the loan which his envoy had also requested, and they would simply tell the latter that the Republic had had to meet so many expenses through the past year that his Majesty must excuse them.⁹⁰ By this time Sigismund must have been too busy to worry about his failure to receive the loan (he had only asked for 7,000 ducats), and he was doubtless glad to learn that Venice would send four galleys to the Bosphorus, for in France the expedition was already getting under way.

The Franco-Burgundian army, going east under John of Nevers's direct command, was to assemble at Dijon on 20 April (1396) to be paid for the coming campaign. Thereafter they were to move on to the county of Montbéliard, whence they would set out on the thirtieth. John had already taken leave of the king on the sixth, after which he went with his father to S. Denis, where they said their prayers, and the duke committed his son "à la garde de Dieu et de monseigneur Saint Denys." John was in Dijon on the thirteenth to supervise the final arrangements; his family gathered to bid him goodbye and good luck; and on the afternoon of the thirtieth he left to join the host at Montbéliard. They crossed the Rhine north of Freiburg, and quickly reached the upper valley of the Danube through the region of Breisgau.⁹¹ Their route took them through Regensburg to Straubing, where John was fêted by his brother-in-law Albrecht II of Bavaria, and thence through Passau and Linz to Vienna, where he was awaited by Leopold IV of Austria, another brother-in-law.⁹² His family alliances thus proved as helpful to John as the course of the Danube, in facilitating his advance southeastward.

Enguerrand VII de Coucy, his son-in-law Henri de Bar, and a small contingent left

Paris sometime after 18 April. They made the journey to Buda by way of Milan, whither Charles VI sent Coucy to dissuade Gian Galeazzo Visconti from interfering with the French acquisition of Genoa.⁹³ Froissart represents Gian Galeazzo as sending Bayazid falcons, dogs, fine cloths, and (more to the point) the most detailed information concerning the crusading army, "tout par nom et par sournom, les chiefs des barons de France," says Bayazid, "qui me devoient venir veoir et faire guerre. . . ." Bayazid made this statement, according to Froissart, to the soldan of Egypt, whom he was visiting at the time!⁹⁴ From Milan, Coucy and Henri de Bar went with their followers to Venice, where on 29 May (1396) they appeared before the Signoria with letters from Charles VI, requesting a *galea grossa* to take them to Segna (Senj). The Senate promptly granted their request, with one dissenting vote, since such a galley was already *in ordine* in the Arsenal, and could be ready to cross the Adriatic the following day.⁹⁵ From Segna, Coucy and Henri de Bar with their small contingent obviously went by land, their route lying presumably through Karlstadt (Karlovac), Agram (Zagreb), and Warasdin (Varazdin), and around Lake Balaton to Buda, where Sigismund was busy marshaling his own forces.

In the meantime Philippe d'Artois, the con-

⁹⁰ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 428, 430, 438 ff.

⁹⁰ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. DXIII, pp. 363–65, docs. dated 11–14 April, 1396.

⁹¹ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 428, who erroneously states that John of Nevers embarked on the crusade toward the end of March; Froissart, XV, 230–31, is equally inaccurate, setting the starting date as 20 May and giving the wrong route to Austria; Jean Juvénal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI*, in Michaud and Poujoulat, *Nouvelle Collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, II (1850), 408a, contents himself with merely observing of the crusaders that "si s'en partirent et passèrent par les Allemagnes," which gains in accuracy what it lacks in information. I have followed Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 246, who relied on Dom Plancher, *Histoire de Bourgogne*, III, 148–49.

⁹² Cf. Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 23–24; von Šišić, in *Wissensch. Mitt. aus Bosnien*, VI, 308.

⁹⁴ Froissart, XV, 251–53, who puts the crusading army at "plus de cent mille [hommes]." On rather slender evidence but with much insight Paul Durrieu, "Jean Sans-Peur, duc de Bourgogne, lieutenant et procureur général du Diable es parties d'Occident," *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, XXIV (1887), 209–18, has argued that Gian Galeazzo probably did keep Bayazid informed of preparations for the crusade, receiving his information from his daughter Valentina Visconti and her husband Louis I, duke of Orléans. Certainly Gian Galeazzo had everything to gain from the failure of the French in the crusade, which would render ineffective the approaching Franco-Florentine alliance (of September, 1396) against Milan; for a while he feared that the unpredictable Richard II might be drawn into the alliance (see D. M. Bueno de Mesquita, "The Foreign Policy of Richard II in 1397: Some Italian Letters," *English Historical Review*, LVI [1941], 628–37).

⁹⁵ Misti, Reg. 43, fols. 127^r, 137^r, cited by Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 248, and II, 25. Ogier VIII d'Anglure, returning from his pilgrimage to the Holy Land, spent from 23 to 29 May in Venice, where he saw Coucy and Henri de Bar, who furnished Ogier and his companions with *lettres de passage* to facilitate their return to France (Fr. Bonnardot and A. Longnon, eds., *Le Saint Voyage de Jérusalem du seigneur d'Anglure*, Paris, 1878, p. 98 (Société des Anciens Textes français). I find Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp. 52–53, quite unconvincing.

stable of France, had arrived with the vanguard of the Christian forces at Vienna on the feast of Pentecost (21 May, 1396), and a month later John of Nevers appeared with the main army (on S. John's day, 24 June). Provisions were sent down the Danube in boats, and sometime in late July the crusaders reached Buda, where Sigismund welcomed the young count of Nevers with "grande révérence." The biographer of Boucicaut reckons "us French and the other foreigners," together with the Hungarians, at a "full hundred thousand horse."⁹⁶ The crusaders were a reckless, undisciplined horde, and had pillaged their way to Buda.⁹⁷ The ecclesiastics now warned the leaders of the host to drive away the female camp followers (*fatuae et leves mulierculae*) and to put an end to the adultery and every sort of fornication, drunkenness, gambling, blasphemous oaths, and other terrible excesses which had thus far been rife—otherwise they would bring down the wrath of God upon themselves. "But it was no use," says the chronicler of S. Denis, "and just as if they had told a tall tale to a deaf ass."⁹⁸

Sigismund apparently wanted to let Bayazid and the Ottoman army tire itself out by a long overland march to make contact with the Christian forces, which could thus take their stand in prepared defensive positions. He probably wanted to penetrate only far enough into Serbia to provoke Bayazid into opposition. The French knights, however, were impatient for action. They insisted upon advancing to meet

the infidels, and Sigismund was doubtless relieved to get them out of Hungarian territory.⁹⁹ Tactics were discussed, and Sigismund suggested that the Hungarian (and German and Vlach) infantry should first advance under his command to meet the riffraff (*gregarii, abiectionissimi et semiarmati viri*) whom Bayazid would doubtless send ahead of the main body of his army. When the first Turkish attack had been thus contained, the allied command might then consider when and at what point to strike with the French cavalry. The older and wiser heads in the Christian camp agreed with this counsel, "but the king's advice seemed unworthy of acceptance in the eyes of the younger [knights], who easily yielded to the dictates of their heart." Philippe d' Artois and the Marshal Boucicaut agreed with them. They were in favor of establishing an order of battle, but they had not come across the continent to follow in the footsteps of Sigismund's own riffraff (*gregarii*) "since it has always been the French custom not to follow but to encourage others to follow."¹⁰⁰

Giving advice to these warriors, who had already made up their minds, was "quasi vento verba dare," says the chronicler of S. Denis, and in late August they set out with fatuous resolution on the road to disaster. They went down the Danube valley in two or three divisions, and crossed the river somewhere near the Iron Gate, the long, narrow gorge of the Danube between Orsova and Turnu-Severin. There were 60,000 mounted men, says Froissart, and it took them more than eight days to get from the left to the right or southern bank of the Danube.¹⁰¹ We have already noted that the biographer of Boucicaut says the total of the Christian forces easily amounted "à cent mille chevaux," but the figures given by the chroniclers are rhetorical devices intended to impart a sense of grandeur to their narrative. It is astonishing that most of the historians of the Nicopolis campaign have taken them seriously.

The crusaders' first serious engagement was at Vidin, which the Bulgarian prince Sracimir,

⁹⁶ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxii, pp. 590–91, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxiii, p. 237. Juvénal, *Histoire de Charles VI*, p. 408a, says that the crusaders' march to their destination required "bien trois mois," which would put their arrival at Buda in late July, and cf. the *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 482, 484: "Discursis tribus mensibus a recessu christiani exercitus cum . . . ad Danubium . . . pervenisset, deliberatum extitit qualiter et per quas vias progredieretur ulterius." Cf. Delaville Le Roulx, I, 249. On 20–21 July the citizens of Zara (*Iadrenses*) dispatched a galley *ad partes orientales* for three months' service with Sigismund, *dominus noster rex* (G. Fejér, ed., *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae*, tom. X, vol. II [Buda, 1834], no. ccxli, p. 410). On 20 July the Venetian Senate voted to send certain orders to the captain of the Gulf "in casu quo dominus rex Hungarie veniat ad partes Constantinopolis" (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 43, fol. 143').

⁹⁷ Cf. Juvénal, p. 408a, who says the Franco-Burgundian host had been well received in the Germanies, "mais pourtant ne laissoient-ils point qu' ils ne pillassent et derobassent, et fissent maux innumerables de pilleries et roberies, lubricitez, et choses non honnestes."

⁹⁸ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 484.

⁹⁹ Cf. Froissart, XV, 242–44, who says that, after the defeat of Bayazid, the French talked of "conquering all Turkey and going as far as the Persian empire . . . and we shall conquer all the kingdom of Syria and the Holy Land of Jerusalem, and we shall deliver it from the hands of the soldan and the enemies of our Lord."

¹⁰⁰ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 486, 488, 490.

¹⁰¹ Froissart, XV, 245.

a Turkish vassal, surrendered without opposition; the soldiers of the cross then slaughtered the Turkish component in the garrison, and left 300 men of their own to hold the city.¹⁰² John of Nevers was knighted under the walls of Vidin,¹⁰³ and the crusaders soon continued down the Danube to Rahova (Rachowa, Oryakhovo), a well-fortified town in Turkish hands. The chronicler of S. Denis informs us that by now the first week of September had come; he also says that Rahova was surrounded by double walls, equipped with defense towers; the garrison was "agile and robust," and had an abundance of provisions. The biographer of Boucicaut states that as soon as the latter and Philippe d' Artois, the count of Eu, realized that Sigismund was making for Rahova, they rushed ahead "pour y estre des premiers." Accompanied by Philippe de Bar, Enguerrand de Coucy, and "plusieurs grands seigneurs," they rode all night and reached Rahova in the morning. At their approach the Turks tried to destroy a bridge which gave access to the town over a broad moat, but Boucicaut was upon them too soon, and fighting furiously, "luy et ses gens," he drove them back into the town, and repulsed their several efforts to reach the bridge until Sigismund arrived with reinforcements.¹⁰⁴

The chronicler of S. Denis, however, is less impressed with the prowess of his countrymen who, "confident of their own strength and holding the enemy in contempt," had set out for Rahova, a full five hundred of them. But they made no headway at all in their futile assaults upon the town, from which the defenders emerged in rapid sorties (*erupciones*

dampnosas in nostros sepius et clandestinas faciebant), and took a heavy toll of foolish Christian life. Philippe d' Artois, Boucicaut, and their forces would have had to abandon their ill-advised venture in ignominious defeat if Sigismund had not appeared with soldiery enough to press the siege in more effective fashion. This increase of Christian strength was discouraging to the besieged, who soon found themselves assailed on all sides; they offered to surrender Rahova if they might withdraw unharmed, but the crusaders rejected the offer. Enterprising knights were already scaling the walls. The gates were forced open, and the attackers poured into the town. The Christians slaughtered the terrified inhabitants without regard for sex or age (*horrenda strages agitur absque discrecione sexus vel etatis*), but a thousand of the richer ones are said to have saved their lives by accepting Christianity and promising to pay a ransom.¹⁰⁵

After the experience at Rahova, Sigismund is said to have warned "all and singly" of the dangers of precipitate action, suggesting that while *iuventutis fervor* might win battles, *gravitas senectutis* was required to plan them. The chronicler of S. Denis says that the French would not listen, however, and announced that the Turks were too frightened to come within sight of them. Leaving a garrison of two hundred men in Rahova, the high command and the army continued down the Danube to Nicopolis (Nikopol), which they reached about 8–10 September (1396). Here they ran into trouble. Nicopolis was built on an apparently impregnable height, overlooking the Danube on the north side. It had high, double walls, the usual defense towers, a determined commandant, and a large population. "The Turks were much concerned to hold this place," says the chronicler, "thinking that if it fell under the sway of the Christians, nothing would remain to prevent their further advance, and the Turkish loss would be immense." Nicopolis commanded the valley of the river Olt, and gave the Turks easy entrance into Wallachia. Although the city covered a wide area, the crusaders were able to throw a cordon around

¹⁰² Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae*, tom. X, vol. II (1834), nos. CCKLVII–CCKLVIII, pp. 420–21, 426, and cf. Delaville Le Roulx, I, 252–53. Earlier in the year Sracimir had been captured by Bayazid's forces, and his son had fled to Hungary. On the garrison of 300 men left at Vidin, note *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia, and Africa (1396–1427)*, trans. J. Buchan Telfer, London, 1879, repr. New York, 1970, pp. 2, 107 (Hakluyt Society, 1st ser., no. LVIII). Schiltberger calls Vidin "Pudem."

¹⁰³ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chap. XXII, p. 591a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chap. XXIII, p. 237a, where Vidin is called "Baudins." Froissart, XV, 248, says that "more than three hundred" others were knighted at the same time. It was a custom for knighthood often to be conferred at a first encounter with the enemy.

¹⁰⁴ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chap. XXIII, pp. 591–92, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chap. XXIV, pp. 237–38, and cf. Fejér, *Codex*, X-2, no. CCLII, pp. 447–48.

¹⁰⁵ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 492, 494. Delaville Le Roulx, I, 253–54, prefers the account in the *Livre des faits*, which says that Boucicaut and his men turned the captured Turks over to Sigismund, "qui tous les fit mourir." When it comes to details, both sources seem unreliable to me, and Froissart, XV, 246–51, is apparently off on a tangent so completely his own as to have nothing to do with history.

most of the long line of walls. Lacking enough catapults and other equipment for an effective siege, they kept a vigilant watch at all the gates to prevent the garrison and the inhabitants from receiving supplies. Day and night they shot over the walls bolts from cross-bows and stones from such catapults as they had. The chronicler of S. Denis says they kept up this bombardment for seventeen days. Jean Juvénal also gives seventeen days as the length of the siege, but according to the author of the *Livre des faits de Boucicaut*, it was a matter of fifteen days. At length the rumor ran through the Christian camps that the besieged had reached the depths of discouragement, "and truly we do believe," says the chronicler, "they would have surrendered if their prayers had not hastened Bayazid's coming to their rescue." The Christians said prayers too. The priests organized processions around the walls, and implored God to aid their enterprise and withhold success from the Moslem blasphemers. "But merciful God did not hearken to these prayers, very likely because those for whom they were said, had shown themselves unworthy of grace."

The French barons entertained one another with splendid banquets, passing from one gorgeous pavilion to another, wearing new clothes with rich embroideries and with sleeves so long they could hardly find their hands. Their long pointed shoes astonished the Turkish captives. It was the era of the *souliers à la poulaine*, which the chronicler calls *calciamenta rostrata*, the "prow" of the shoe extending some two feet from the foot (so that the wearer often had to tie the toes of his shoes below his knees). The transports had brought fine wines and delicacies down the Danube. There was no discipline in the camp. The prostitutes were kept busy, and the crusaders spent their time and wages in the futility of gambling. The austere chronicler of S. Denis reports that the "God-fearing" Bayazid believed that these wild warriors were "provoking their own God, Christ, to wrath," and that they were more worthy of reprehension than of victory.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 494, 496, 498; Juvénal, *Hist. de Chas.* VI, p. 408b; and cf. Johann Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, p. 2, who says that the siege of Nicopolis lasted sixteen days. According to the author of the *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxiv, p. 593, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxv, pp. 239-40, the French were surprised by the appearance of the Turkish army at the dinner hour on the sixteenth day of the siege. He also

Bayazid is alleged to have sent the defenders of Nicopolis a message that he was being delayed because of the slow pace of the foot soldiery, but that if it was the will of Allah, he would come to help them within three days. Christian foraging parties ran into Turks several times, and spread warnings through the dissolute camp. And yet Boucicaut knew that the Turks would not dare risk an engagement with the heroic French; he regarded those who spread rumors to the contrary as *latrones et proditores pessimi*. He had their ears cut off, or had them severely beaten.¹⁰⁷

It does not matter where Bayazid was when he first learned that the French, Burgundians, Hungarians, and Germans were descending the Danube to attack him. He soon designated Philippopolis (Plovdiv) on the Maritsa as the mustering place of the Ottoman forces. From there he moved on toward Tirnovo through the Shipka Pass, and was joined in the valley of the river Osum, just south of Nicopolis, by his Serbian vassal Stephen Lazarević, the son and successor of the dead hero of Kossovo. "It was the last Sunday in the month of September [the twenty-fourth]," says the chronicler of S. Denis, "when the news of the enemy's coming became known." The crusaders reacted with unexpected terror, and immediately raised the siege of Nicopolis. They slew their prisoners

notes that Sigismund had had two large "mines" dug under the walls of Nicopolis, but the effort achieved nothing. Incidentally, Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 61, believes that during the crusaders' two-weeks siege "the Venetian and Genoese ships cut off all communications between the besieged and the outer world by sea. . . ." By what sea? There were no Genoese ships assisting the crusaders, and no Venetian "ships" anywhere near Nicopolis. We have seen that the Senate reluctantly agreed to put four galleys at Sigismund's disposal. The Venetian chroniclers raised the four galleys to forty-four, and rather surprisingly added the Genoese. Cf. Germain Lefèvre-Pontalis and Léon Dorez, eds., *Chronique d'Antonio Morosini: Extraits relatifs à l'histoire de France*, 4 vols., Paris, 1898-1902, I, 8: "I Veniziany e Zenovexi a insenbre e' fexe armada de galie a la suma de galie XLIIII per andar intro el destreto de Romania a daniziar i dity Turchy. . . ." Marino Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi di Venezia*, in *RISS*, XXII (Milan, 1733), cols. 762E-763A, continued the literary legend that the crusaders had the support of "a fleet of 44 galleys" (Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, p. 25; Delaville Le Roulx, I, 287; Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 55).

¹⁰⁷ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 500. Froissart, XV, 264-68, says that Enguerrand de Coucy went out on a scouting mission with "cinq cens lances et autretant d' arbalestriers, tous montés à cheval;" they caught 20,000 Turks in an ambush, and visited death and destruction upon all who did not succeed in taking flight.

(taken at Rahova), for there was no further hope of collecting ransom for them. Later, on that same day, the news came that Bayazid's army was only six miles away, and before the sun rose on Monday (the twenty-fifth) Sigismund himself rode into the French camp to share his information with the barons. He urged them, as he had done before, to allow the "forty thousand foot whom he had brought" to go into battle first, and the wiser heads in the French council of war agreed with him. But Philippe d'Artois, the constable, and Marshal Boucicaut contemptuously rejected the advice of the *prudenciores*, and Sigismund returned to his own quarters in fear and foreboding that these madcaps were going to bring them all to a bad end.¹⁰⁸

Attempts to determine the size of the Christian army at Nicopolis have proved futile. The lowest estimate is that given by the Bavarian Johann Schiltberger who, when barely sixteen years of age, participated in the battle, and was captured. He informs us that the Christian forces were to be reckoned at 16,000 men, while Bayazid's army numbered 200,000. Schiltberger served as a runner for the lord Lienhart Richarteringer, who was killed in the battle; he must have heard the size of the allied Christian forces discussed during the long march down the Danube valley.¹⁰⁹ We have just

noted the chronicler of S. Denis's statement that Sigismund wished to form the vanguard of the crusading army with the "forty thousand foot whom he had brought with him" (*peditum quadraginta milia quos secum traxerat*).¹¹⁰ Owing especially to the vanity of Philippe d'Artois and Guy de la Trémoille, however, the French led the attack upon the Turks. When they got out upon the field, says Froissart, many experienced knights and squires knew "that the day was lost" (*que la journée ne pouvoit estre pour euls*). They were richly armed, beautifully dressed, "and in so fine array that each seemed to be a king," but there were only seven hundred of them. This statement may come closer to the truth than anything else Froissart tells us about the Nicopolis crusade.

Many of the French knights now saw their folly, he continues, for if they had waited for Sigismund, he would have brought 60,000 "Hungarians" (including Germans and Vlachs?) into the field with him. In the meantime the two wings of the Ottoman army were beginning to advance with (we are told) 40,000 men in each. Froissart sets the total of Bayazid's army at 200,000,¹¹¹ and represents the sultan as assessing his Christian opponents at 100,000,¹¹² which is also the figure we find given by Boucicaut's biographer as the total of the crusading army.¹¹³ As we move into Germany, however, the Nuremberg chronicler Ulman Stromer (d. 1407) puts the total at only 30,000 knights, squires, and varlets,¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 500, 502: ". . . in corde suo presagiens quod sequencia fine pessimo clauderentur. . . ." Cf. the account in Juvénal, *Hist. de Chas.* VI, pp. 408b-409a, who states that Sigismund tried to make it clear that if the Hungarians and Germans preceded the French into battle, "ils s'efforceroient de bien combattre, et si ne pourroient fuir ou reculer," for the French would be pressing in upon them. Otherwise the Hungarians and Germans might well flee from the field, "et demeureroient les François perdus et desconfits." The French, however, persisted "en leur opinion et requeste d'avoir l'avantgarde," although Enguerrand de Coucy agreed with Sigismund. Johann Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3, tells a similar story of the French determination to lead the attack. Froissart, XV, 312-13, indicates that the French were taken unawares by the arrival of the Turks, but were delighted that their hour of glory was at hand: they pushed back the tables at which they were dining, demanded their arms and horses, but they had "wine in the head" (*le vin en la teste*) as they rode to the field where the banner of the Virgin was unfurled. Cf. Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, pp. 259-62.

¹⁰⁹ Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, p. 2. That Schiltberger's estimate of the Christian army is only 16,000, says Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, p. 30, is "offenbar in Folge eines argen Gedächtnisfehlers" (!), and Delaville Le Roulx, I, 265, note 8, says that figure is a manifest error, and "nous savons qu'il faut lire soixante mille" (!). We know nothing of the sort,

but the learned historian of the Ottoman empire, Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, *Gesch. d. osman. Reiches*, I (Pest, 1827, repr. Graz, 1963), 238, seems also to have assumed that Schiltberger must have meant 60,000.

According to Philippe de Mézières, *L'Épître lamentable et consolatoire sur le fait de la desconfiture lacrimable de Nicopoli* (written early in 1397), ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, in his edition of Froissart, XVI, 452, "by the account of those who were present on that lamentable day, the king of Hungary had in his royal host 150,000 combatants, and Bayazid had hardly a lesser number."

¹¹⁰ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 500.

¹¹¹ Froissart, XV, 310-11, 315-16. Sigismund's infantry poses an insoluble problem, because the Hungarians were primarily horsemen (Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 263-64), but it does not do to press any of these sources too closely).

¹¹² Froissart, XV, 242.

¹¹³ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. XXII, p. 591a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. XXIII, p. 237a.

¹¹⁴ U. Stromer, *Püchel von mein geslechet und von abenteuer [1349-1407]*, ed. Karl Hegel, *Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, Nürnberg, I (Leipzig, 1862), 48-49, cited by Delaville

although the Paduan chronicle of the Gatari, which dates from about the same period, raises the figure to 84,000.¹¹⁵ As for the Turks, the chronicler of S. Denis assures us in a most interesting passage that he took particular pains (*investigans et querens diligencius*) to find out the size of Bayazid's forces, and came to the conclusion that there were some 24,000 in the Turkish vanguard (*gregarii*), 30,000 horse in the next division (*equestres homines*), and 40,000 in the main body of troops over whom Bayazid took direct command at the rear, making a total of 94,000 men in the Ottoman army.¹¹⁶ The numbers of participants in the battle of Nicopolis rose in magnitude and in absurdity as wild rumors spread and as time passed, to such an extent that we read in the *Annales Estenses* that Bayazid's army contained 400,000 men.¹¹⁷

As historical sources the chroniclers are unreliable, and their numerical estimates of Moslem strength and Christian weakness are rarely to be taken seriously. But modern historians do not seem to have been much more critical in their calculations. Alois Brauner, whose dissertation was perhaps the first significant contribution to the history of the Nicopolis campaign, believes that we shall not be going far wrong if we place the total of the allied Christian army at 100,000 men and Bayazid's forces at 120–130,000.¹¹⁸ Delaville Le Roulx puts the Christian forces all told at 100,000 and the Turkish at about 110,000, but he thinks that Kiss's estimate that 120,000 Christians took part in the battle has the "merit of plausibility."¹¹⁹ Von Šišić accepts these figures, and believes that we "come very close to the actual numerical relationships" with 120,000 men in the Christian army and about 110,000 in that

of Bayazid.¹²⁰ More recently Atiya repeats the same general figures, 100,000 in the Christian army, and about 110,000 in that of Bayazid.¹²¹ Cognasso informs us flatly that there were 120,000 crusaders, of whom 14,000 were French, while the sultan had 100,000 men.¹²² When the exaggerations of the chroniclers have been repeated frequently enough, they appear to gain currency as fact.

Scant attention has ever been paid, however, to Froissart's assertion that he had himself been told that, when they met the Turks, the French knights numbered scarcely 700, "sicomme il me fut dit, ils n' estoient pas sept cens."¹²³ Atiya himself passes lightly over two Turkish chronicles which place Bayazid's strength at 10,000 men,¹²⁴ and of course Schiltberger believed the army in which he had served, had only 16,000 men. Rosetti came to the conclusion, after visiting the battlefield, that there was not room enough in the area south of Nicopolis for 100,000 men to maneuver, much less two armies of that size.¹²⁵ It is small wonder, therefore, that Gustav Kling should have reduced the Christian forces to 9,000, and those of Bayazid to 16–20,000, and that Hans Delbrück believes that, while the Christians may well have begun with some 9–10,000 mounted men, probably not more than 7,500 were available (after the losses on a long march) to take part in the battle of Nicopolis. Delbrück estimates the Turkish army at 10–12,000.¹²⁶ In any event it was not beyond

¹¹⁵ Von Šišić, "Schlacht bei Nicopolis," *Wissensch. Mitt. aus Bosnien*, VI (1899), 312.

¹²¹ Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp. 66–69, 183–85 (notes), who throughout his work (cf. also p. 216) refers to the *Archivio Muratoriano* when he means the *Rerum italicarum scriptores*. He also gives the report of the chronicler of S. Denis on the size of the Turkish army (94,000) inaccurately as 104,000. Note also his *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (1938), pp. 440, 446, where he has reduced his estimate of Turkish strength to 104,000 men, based upon his inaccurate reading of the *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 504. In his brief account of Nicopolis, Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III (repr. Cambridge, 1966), 456 ff., relies solely on Atiya, and repeats his figures as well as certain other errors.

¹²² Francesco Cognasso, *Storia delle crociate*, Milan, 1967, p. 955.

¹²³ Froissart, XV, 315.

¹²⁴ Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 68.

¹²⁵ Rosetti, *Slavonic Review*, XV (1936–37), 633–34, who compares the battle of 1396 with that of July, 1877, which was also fought at Nicopolis, where a Turkish force of 8,000 met Russian units totaling 10,000 on an allegedly "more extended front."

¹²⁶ Gustav Kling, *Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis im Jahre 1396*, diss. Berlin, 1906, cited by Rosetti and also by Hans

Le Roulx, I, 264–65, who of course wants to increase the figure.

¹¹⁶ Galeazzo and [his son] Bartolommeo Gatari, *Cronaca Carrarese [1318–1407]*, eds. A. Medin and G. Tolomei, ad ann. 1396, in the new Muratori, *RSS*, XVII, pt. 1 (1912), p. 451: "e fu per numero LXXXIII millia Christiani."

¹¹⁷ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 504.

¹¹⁸ Jac. de Delayto, in the so-called *Annales Estenses*, ad ann. 1396, in *RSS*, XVIII (Milan, 1731), col. 935C, allegedly based on the copy of a letter sent from Hungary to the effect that "la battaja duroe sette di[!], et per quello scrive il conte di Temesvar, che lo re ghe manda a dire che furono quattroceto millia Turchi."

¹¹⁹ Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 31, 33–34.

¹²⁰ Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 265–66, 269, citing the Hungarian historian K. Kiss, *A' Nikápolyi ütközet*, in the *Magyar Akadémiai érteztitő* (Pest, 1855), p. 266.

the logistical capacity of the later fourteenth century to maintain 12–16,000 men-at-arms and infantry on the march and to feed the horses necessary to keep them on the move. It is quite likely that Bayazid's army was rather larger than that of the Christians by the time the opposing sides had both reached Nicopolis, but the numbers of combatants involved were probably within the range suggested by Kling, Rosetti, and Delbrück.

Although his cavalry had had to adjust their speed to that of the foot soldiery, Bayazid had advanced rapidly. Decisiveness had won him the surname *Ildirim*, "the Thunderbolt."¹²⁷ As his army approached Nicopolis, disagreement still divided the high command of the crusading host. Enguerrand de Coucy and the admiral Jean de Vienne agreed with Sigismund's plan to allow the Hungarian and "foreign" contingents to meet the Turkish vanguard first, and thus to reserve the French knights for heavy charges against the sultan's best troops, which would certainly be held back during the initial clash of opposing forces. Philippe d' Artois, count of Eu and constable of France, however, was indignant at the thought of following Hungarians, Germans, and Vlachs into battle. The hot-headed Boucicaut agreed with him, and nothing could restrain the French exuberance for rushing into headlong collision with an enemy of whose tactics and strength they knew little or nothing. The chronicler of S. Denis would have us believe, in fact, that the French crusaders' chief preparation before entering the fray was to cut off the "long, flowing toes of their shoes" (*rostra longua et superflua calceorum*) so that they could walk more freely, and this (he says) was how that absurd fashion in footwear came to an end.¹²⁸

Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte*, III (Berlin, 1923, repr. 1964), 498, 501.

¹²⁷ Cf. Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1958, II, 137–38.

¹²⁸ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 502, 504. According to Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3, 110, the voivode Mircea of Wallachia ("Merterwaywod") had asked Sigismund "that he might be the first to attack, to which the king would willingly have assented," but John of Nevers would allow neither Vlachs nor Hungarians to precede the French in their attack upon Bayazid's army. Contrary to the accounts in the French chroniclers, Schiltberger also states that, when Nevers and the French had been forced to surrender, Sigismund "defeated a body of twelve thousand [Turkish] foot soldiers . . . sent to oppose him," of which Atiyya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 93, makes too much. In 1395 the voivode Mircea had made a solemn undertaking "to go in person against the Turks" whenever Sigismund should do

The biographer of Boucicaut strenuously denies that his countrymen advanced to meet the Turks "comme bestes sans ordonnance . . . , que ce n' est mie vray," and claims that they appeared before Sigismund all ready for action "en très belle ordonnance." He states that the Turks were also drawn up in beautiful array, their van consisting of "a great horde on horseback," *une grande tourbe . . . à cheval*, as he describes the *akinji* or light cavalry of irregulars. Beyond these the crusaders could see a mass of infantry, "and behind these people on horseback, between them and those on foot, they had planted a great abundance of pointed stakes which they had prepared for this purpose . . . , set into the ground at an angle, the points turned toward our men, so high that they could enter a horse's belly." Bayazid had placed his archers behind the infantry, we are told, and he had well nigh "30,000" of them, as well as further *batailles* both on horse (the *sipahis*) and on foot (the *janissaries*), whom he kept at the rear.¹²⁹

The chronicler of S. Denis also mentions the stakes, *appendentes cuspides contra nostros*, and informs us that Bayazid remained far in the rear, hidden behind a hill, on the slopes of which he had mustered the main body of his troops. When the French attacked, the stakes hobbled their horses. The chronicler says that the Turkish vanguard of *gregarii* fought well, but sword in hand the French cut their way through the serried ranks of their opponents, allegedly killing 10,000 of them. Then they advanced upon the Turkish cavalry (his account differs from that of the biographer of Boucicaut), only a bowshot away. Believing that Bayazid was himself in command of his cavalry, the French made a sudden, impetuous attack, without taking the time to reform their lines (*non . . . acie ordinata*). They hoped that the speed of their assault would offset the Turks' advantage in numbers. Bayazid's cavalry recoiled under the shock of the attack, and (according to the chronicler) suffered 5,000 casualties. Tired by their exertions, bathed in sweat from the heat of the day, burdened by the weight of their arms and armor, the French tried to

so (Fejér, *Codex*, X-2, no. CLV, pp. 270–73); when the time came, Mircea kept his word, although (as we shall see) he left the field of Nicopolis when he saw the inevitability of disaster.

¹²⁹ Cf. *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. XXIV, pp. 593b–594a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. XXV, pp. 239b–240a.

pursue their opponents, who broke into flight. Their commanders made vain attempts to stop them, but they pushed uphill to the point of exhaustion, believing that the fortunes of war had succumbed to their prowess.

When they reached the summit of the hill, they saw the main body of Bayazid's troops. The sultan was in their midst. Now the French were to pay the price of their sins, their blasphemy, cruelty, gambling, and wenching. Fear seized them. Their commanders could not get them to reform their lines; they who had advanced like lions, now retreated like hares. The Hungarians, Germans, and Vlachs took to flight, leaving the French to face the sultan's wrath—*sic . . . gloria quasi fumus evanuit*. The Turks sounded their trumpets and tambours; their horse and foot moved in for the kill. Despite the general rout, some of the French, like the valiant admiral Jean de Vienne, stood their ground. He had carried into battle the standard of the Virgin, and spread death among the infidels who attacked him, "mais il fut là occis," says Froissart, "la banière Nostre-Dame entre ses poings, et ainsi fut-il trouvé." When the Turks came upon John of Nevers, they found him surrounded by members of his retinue, who fell to their knees and pled for his life. The Turks spared him, for they were tiring of the carnage. Many of the French now followed John's example and surrendered. Instead of fighting they chose the yoke of servitude and the stain of everlasting infamy, says the chronicler of S. Denis, "little realizing that the next day would bring them death." Some of the crusaders succeeded in reaching the river-boats in which they had come down the Danube, but they piled aboard in such numbers that the boats sank beneath their weight. Others did escape from the area, but most of them perished on the long journey home, *consumpti fame et frigore*. Few ever reached their native soil. On the day after the battle, according to the chronicler, the victorious Bayazid forced the defeated John of Nevers to witness the execution of 3,000 Christian captives to atone for the massacre of the prisoners of Rahova and for the deaths of the "30,000" Turks who still lay on the field of Nicopolis.¹³⁰

¹³⁰ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 504–18, and cf. Juvénal, *Hist. de Chas. VI*, in Michaud and Poujoulat, *Nouvelle Collection des mémoires*, II, 409b. Froissart describes at length and with his usual inaccuracy the battle of Nicopolis, the

The biographer of Boucicaut gives a different account of the battle. He puts the Turkish light horse in the first line of the sultan's troops, and describes how they wheeled around like a flight of birds at the approach of the crusaders, who were stopped short by the pointed stakes and a hailstorm of arrows. Horses were impaled, and their riders thrown. Most of the French probably dismounted, but others stayed in the saddle. When the Hungarians saw "ceste entrée de bataille," they began to retreat "comme lasches et faillis que ils furent." Nevertheless, with Boucicaut's example and encouragement, the French finally fought their way through the stakes. His biographer heaps scorn upon the Hungarians for their desertion of the valiant French: "no people in the world have ever been more daring or better warriors, more steadfast or more chivalrous than the French!" Forgetting any further discussion of tactics, he launches into a paean of praise of his countrymen, and dwells on the feats of Boucicaut, Nevers, Eu, the brothers Bar, La Marche, Coucy, and Trémoille. "But, alas, what good did it do them, a handful of men against so many thousands!"

Bayazid was dismayed by the exploits of the French (or so we are informed), and for a while he was prepared to flee. When he learned how few the French were, however, and how the king of Hungary had deserted them, Bayazid took heart, and threw in masses of fresh troops. Although outnumbered twenty to one, the crusaders are said to have slain 20,000 of the enemy, "but our lords of French blood, most of the barons, and many knights and squires were taken prisoner." Johann Schiltberger, who was himself captured in the battle, claims that when the French were thus forced to surrender, Sigismund's Hungarian and German troops came up from the rear to carry on the attack. It was apparently at this critical juncture that Mircea, the voivode of Wallachia, whose Vlachs

subsequent ransoming of the French nobles, their return home, and the alleged attitude of Bayazid toward Europe and Christianity (Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., *Œuvres de Froissart, Chroniques*, XV [Brussels, 1871], 312–60, and XVI [1872], 29–68). There is a worthless account of the battle in the *Annales Mediolanenses*, chap. CLVIII, in *RISS*, XVI (Milan, 1730), col. 826; the brief notice in Sozomeno da Pistoia, *Specimen historiae*, *ibid.*, col. 1162BC, is of small value, and that of Lorenzo Bonincontri da S. Miniato, *Annales*, ad ann. 1396, *ibid.*, XXI (1732), col. 72E, of even less. Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1396, no. 18, vol. VII (vol. XXVI of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1752), pp. 609–11, merely quotes Bonfinius.

made up the left (east) wing of Sigismund's forces, and Stephen Lacković, the voivode of Siebenbürgen, whose Transylvanians constituted the right (west) wing, both fled with their followers from the field, leaving the Hungarians and Germans to carry on as best they could. If we could believe Schiltberger (which we cannot), Sigismund's loyal horse cut down 12,000 Turkish infantry. Their advance was so overwhelming (we are told) that Bayazid was about to flee when his Christian vassal Stephen Lazarević, the despot of Serbia, sent his cavalry into action and saved the day for the Turks. Like the chronicler of S. Denis, both Schiltberger and the biographer of Boucicaut describe the slaughter of Christian prisoners after the battle, a slaughter which Nevers and the French princes of the blood were forced to witness.¹³¹

Froissart, Boucicaut's biographer, and the chronicler of S. Denis all claim to have derived their accounts of the battle from eyewitnesses. There is no reason to doubt them, and no reason to doubt that Schiltberger was captured at Nicopolis. In the hand-to-hand combat of the era, however, neither commanders nor common soldiers really knew who was winning. Confusion was worse confounded. Battles did not take place on a given spot; they extended over a mile or two or more. An eyewitness knew what was happening to him and to those around him, but he knew little else. As time passed he learned more from other "eyewitnesses," and each time he told his tale it grew taller. It is small wonder that contemporary accounts of Nicopolis are at variance with one another, and it is useless to attempt a detailed description of the battle.¹³² One thing

is certain—it was an absolute disaster for the French, and it dampened their crusading ardor forever.

According to Froissart, the battle of Nicopolis had lasted three hours, and the foolhardiness of the French had cost them their worst defeat since the battle of Roncevaux, where the twelve peers of France were slain. Besides Jean de Vienne, who had accompanied Amadeo VI on the Savoyard crusade thirty years before, Guillaume de la Trémoille, the marshal of Burgundy, and one of his sons were killed. Various lesser lords were spared, however, because they were so richly dressed they seemed like kings to the Turks, who coveted the gold and silver in which their ransoms would be paid.¹³³ The surviving leaders of the host also owed their lives to the fact that Bayazid preferred gold to vengeance—John of Burgundy, count of Nevers; Philippe d'Artois, count of Eu; Jacques II de Bourbon, count of La Marche; Enguerrand VII de Coucy and his son-in-law Henri de Bar; Guy de la Trémoille, lord of Sully; and the Marshal Boucicaut as well as perhaps a dozen others. Schiltberger, however, states that fourteen nobles were spared, twelve Frenchmen and two others.¹³⁴ Froissart says that at the sultan's command the Turks butchered "more than three hundred, all gentlemen of diverse nations;" according to Schiltberger, as we have noted, "the people . . . killed on that day were reckoned at ten thousand men;" and we have seen that the chronicler of S. Denis puts the figure at three thousand. Boucicaut would have been among the slain if John of Nevers had not stepped forward, as we learn from Froissart, and pleaded for his life, throwing himself "à deux genoux devant le dit roy Basaach." Bayazid yielded to Nevers's entreaty, and Boucicaut was "set aside" from those being led out to execution. The biographer of

¹³¹ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chaps. xxiv–xxv, pp. 594a–596a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chaps. xxv–xxvi, pp. 240a–243a. Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 3, 5, says that "blood was spilled from morning until vespers, . . . and the people . . . killed on that day were reckoned at ten thousand men," but that he himself was spared, "because none under twenty years of age was killed, and I was scarcely sixteen years old." In recalling the battle of Nicopolis years later Sigismund stated that ". . . caedes fit maxima, et strages indicibilis ex utraque parte committitur, cadentibus innumerabilibus utrimque personis in ore gladii saevientis" (Fejér, *Codex*, X-2, no. CC, pp. 342–43, from a document dated in the year 1412). In July, 1402, Stephen Lazarević once more distinguished himself by his service to Bayazid, who was himself to suffer on the field at Ankara an even more overwhelming defeat than he now inflicted on the Christians.

¹³² On the clash of the opposing forces at Nicopolis and Bayazid's subsequent massacre of the Christian prisoners,

note especially: Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 35–52, who dates the battle incorrectly on 28 September, but knows the sources well; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 270–86, and von Šišić, "Schlacht bei Nicopolis," *Wissenschaft. Mitt. aus Bosnien*, VI, 313–17, who both impart a somewhat specious clarity to events; and Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp. 84–97, and *Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 451–57.

¹³³ Froissart, XV, 315–16, 320. Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, II, no. xxii, 78–86, gives a list of some 325 crusaders known by name, of whom some 80 died in the course of the Nicopolis expedition.

¹³⁴ Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 112; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 286.

Boucicaud tells a similar story of his hero's rescue at the last minute.¹³⁵

Some of the captives, however, were neither slain nor held for ransom. In the citadel at Cairo the merchant Emmanuele Piloti, a Venetian native of Crete, himself saw a choice lot of two hundred "Christian slaves," a gift to the soldan of Egypt from the victors at Nicopolis. Mostly French and Italian, they were all young and handsome, and had been chosen for advancement in the mamluk system. Piloti says that he had the opportunity to talk with them, but unfortunately he does not share with us any of the information they gave him.¹³⁶

"But God assisted [Sigismund] the king of Hungary and [Philibert de Naillac] the grand master of Rhodes," as Froissart informs us,

for they reached the Danube river, where they found anchored a small boat which belonged to the master of Rhodes. They went aboard, only seven of them [actually there were a good many more than seven], and promptly shoved off from the river bank. Otherwise they would all have been killed or captured, for the Turks came up to the river bank, and there was a great slaughter of those who had followed the king and thus thought to save themselves.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Froissart, XV, 320, 325, 327–28; Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, p. 5; *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxv, p. 597, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxvi, p. 243a. According to Froissart, Nevers, who knew no Turkish, saved Boucicaud's life by making a gesture of counting with both hands to show that he would pay a great price; the biographer of Boucicaud states (in the *Livre des faits*) that Nevers caught Bayazid's attention, and put his two thumbs together to show that he looked upon the marshal as his brother.

¹³⁶ Pierre-Herman Dopp, ed., *Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti sur le Passage en Terre Sainte (1420)*, Louvain and Paris, 1958, p. 229 (Publications de l'Université Lovanium de Léopoldville). The text is a French translation made in 1441 of a lost original written between 1420 and 1438–9 under the title *De modo, progressu, ordine ac diligenti providentia habendis in passagio Christianorum pro conquesta Terrae Sanctae*. Dopp's edition replaces that published by Baron de Reiffenberg, in the *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire des provinces de Namur, de Hainaut et de Luxembourg* . . . , IV (Brussels, 1846), 312–419. We shall have further occasion to refer to Piloti's treatise.

¹³⁷ Froissart, XV, 317, and *cf.* Fejér, *Codex*, X-2, nos. CXCIX, CCI, pp. 341, 343–44, with refs.; Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 280–81, with refs. The chronicler Antonio Morosini creates the erroneous impression that there were Venetian (and Genoese) galleys on the Danube, and says that Sigismund went directly aboard "la galia del chapetanio dy Veniciany, zoè de miser Tomado Mozenigo" (*Chronique*, eds. Lefèvre-Pontalis and Dorez, I [1898], 12). Philibert de Naillac was elected grand master of the Hospitallers while he was absent on the Nicopolis crusade (Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes* [1913, repr. 1974], pp. 235–37, 265).

Hungarian documents of the following year (1397) attest to Sigismund's flight "by the waters of the Danube and the sea" (*per Danubii et pelagi flumina*) to Constantinople and thereafter "to our kingdoms of Dalmatia and Croatia."¹³⁸ As Sigismund and his companions, among whom were Archbishop John de Kanizsa of Gran, Count Hermann II of Cilly, and the burgrave John III of Nuremberg, sailed down the Danube, Bayazid transferred his prisoners to Adrianople, where they remained for two weeks, and thence to Gallipoli "where," as Schiltberger says, "the Turks cross the sea, and there three hundred of us remained for two months confined in a tower." When Sigismund reached the Black Sea or the northern Bosphorus, he was taken on board a Venetian galley, for the captain of the Gulf, Tommaso Mocenigo, had moved slowly north to establish contact with him. The Hungarians' passage through the Dardanelles was humiliating, for "[the Turks] took us out of the tower and led us to the sea, and one after the other they abused the king and mocked him, and called to him to come out of the boat and deliver his people; and this they did to make fun of him. . . . But they did not do him any harm, and so he went away."¹³⁹

Sigismund's next moves are described by Giunio Resti (d. 1735), the best of the Ragusan chroniclers. Resti based his work largely on material collected by Giovanni Gondola (d. 1650). They both worked in the Archives of Ragusa, which despite the earthquakes of 1520 and 1667 are still perfectly preserved and beautifully kept (in the Palace of the Sponza):

King Sigismund had fought badly at Nicopolis and lost his army with great slaughter and ruin for his followers. He came very close to falling a prisoner of the Turks himself, a misfortune that he avoided by [coming upon] a little boat with which he fled down the Danube to Constantinople . . . , whence sailing to Rhodes [where Philibert de Naillac, now the "grand" master, disembarked] and passing through the Archipelago, he entered the Adriatic.¹⁴⁰ Arriving with two Venetian galleys on 19 December [1396] at the island of "Calamotta," he was congratulated on behalf of the Republic of Ragusa

¹³⁸ Fejér, *Codex*, X-2, nos. CCXLVII–CCXLVIII, CCLVII, pp. 421, 427, 459, and *cf.* Chalcocondylas, *Hist.*, bk. II (Bonn, pp. 75–76).

¹³⁹ Schiltberger, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹⁴⁰ Sigismund had reached Coron and Modon by 6 December with a squadron of four galleys, three from Venice and one from Zara (Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. DXLI, DXLIII, pp. 393, 394).

by an embassy of three nobles, and he was invited to condescend to come to see the city. He accepted the invitation, and entered the city on the twenty-first of the same month. Among the most important persons with him were John de Kanizsa [*Canissa*], archbishop of Gran [*Strigonia*] . . . , and the latter's brother Stephen. As so great a prince had never before come to Ragusa, it was deemed appropriate to show him how gratifying his arrival was. . . .

The rector Marino di Simone Resti went to meet him with the Senate and with all the nobility, and paying him compliments he presented him with the keys to the city, which were carried before him in a basin, and were then taken from the king and promptly returned to the rector. King Sigismund was lodged in the rectorial palace of the Republic, and through the nine days he stayed there he was maintained at public expense with all his court. The government even ordered that no citizen should dare take any payment for the goods which those of the royal court might buy, but everyone was to come and receive public payment, which was done. The king was presented with a goodly sum of money, and the feudal levy [*censo*], which was paid to Hungary, he [now] received two years in advance. He also obtained, but with great difficulty, a little piece of the robe of Christ our Lord. And in deference to the king the Republic gave the two Venetian galleys, which had brought him to Ragusa, each two hundred ducats, eight consignments of ship's biscuit, and a hundred pieces of mutton.

These demonstrations of the Ragusei's promptitude and devotion pleased Sigismund beyond measure, and to show his gratification he promised to be unceasingly favorable to them and of all his lands to treat them as the most attached to his crown. In the meantime he created the rector a Knight of the Golden Spur, and gave him a golden neck-chain, a sword, and a pair of silver spurs, with the grant of this dignity's forever passing on to his successors. Hence comes the practice, at the funerals of rectors, of putting on the body of the deceased the spurs, the aforesaid sword, and the chain.

But the Republic which made all these courteous gestures did not lose sight of its ruling principle of extending the state of Ragusa. Some word of this was directed to the king, who replied that they would have to discuss this with him in Hungary. . . . Then on the ninth day of his arrival in Ragusa the king left with the two galleys, which had been put in good order and furnished with supplies. Four nobles were sent to accompany him. . . . The galleys took him to Spalato, and thereafter he went on into Croatia.¹⁴¹

Sigismund used his presence in Dalmatia to strengthen his hold on the Adriatic coast against the claims of the restless Ladislas of Naples, who also contested his right to the throne of Hungary. During these years Sigismund accused Ladislas of seeking to marry a daughter of Bayazid in order to obtain the crown of S. Stephen.¹⁴² If there is any truth in the charge, it is an ironic postscript to the Nicopolis crusade.

News of the extent of the Christian defeat was known in Venice on or before 28 October (1396), a month after the battle. The Senate was all too aware that, while events had taken a bad turn for all Christendom, the situation had become especially serious for Venice. Two commissioners were straightway elected to go "to those parts" and take steps for the security of the Republic's colonies and merchants in the Aegean. The Senate wrote Tommaso Mocenigo, captain of the Gulf, who was then believed to be somewhere between Negroponte and Constantinople, to look to the safety of the galleys of Romania and at the same time to do what he could "for the preservation and protection of the city of Constantinople." If anything should "happen to the said city of Constantinople," however, which was quite possible, it could well become too dangerous for Mocenigo to remain in the area. In that event he was to make certain of the safety of the galleys, which must not be allowed to fall into the hands of the Turks. Above all, he must protect Negroponte "et alia loca nostra" in the Aegean.¹⁴³

Serbo-croatian Ivan Gundulić, 1589–1638), whose epic poem "Osman" deals with the relations between the Turks and Christian Slavs. Archbishop John de Kanizsa became ill in Ragusa, and received from outside the city a small quantity of fine wine as a gift. Since it was contrary to law for foreign wines to be imported into Ragusa, the Senate did not wish arbitrarily to allow delivery of the wine despite their anxiety to show Sigismund and his retinue every mark of respect. They therefore summoned a meeting of the Grand Council (Veliko Vijeće), which granted the concession by a large vote. John remained in Ragusa, at the expense of the state, after Sigismund's departure, "e poi fece la medesima strada che aveva fatto il re" (*ibid.*, p. 183).

Sigismund was in Spalato on 4 January, 1397, when he assigned Tommaso Mocenigo, the Venetian captain of the Gulf, a lifetime pension of 1000 ducats a year as a reward for the latter's valor in combatting the Turks and as recompense for protecting his voyage to Dalmatia (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. ix, nos. 56–58, p. 245).

¹⁴² Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus*, X-2, nos. CCXLVI, CCC, CCCXCI, pp. 417, 559, 750 ff., docs. dated 1397–1398, 1400.

¹⁴³ Misti, Reg. 43, fols. 158^r–158^v, resolutions of the Senate dated 28–29 October, 1396, published by Ljubić,

¹⁴¹ Giunio Resti, *Chronica ragusina*, bk. VII, ed. S. Nodilo, in the *Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium*, XXV: *Scriptores*, II (Zagreb, 1893), 182–83. Gondola bore the same name as his contemporary and cousin (in

The Byzantine historian Ducas says that, as the crusaders had moved down the Danube to Nicopolis, Bayazid had withdrawn the Turkish troops then laying siege to Constantinople in order to add them to the army which he was assembling at Philippopolis.¹⁴⁴ The Senate obviously feared that Bayazid now intended to resume in force the siege which he had apparently never entirely abandoned. At this very time (on 27–28 October) the Genoese officials at Pera wrote the Doge Antonio Venier a fulsome letter of thanks for their liberation from the Turks, whose prolonged siege was about to entail their capture and servitude until the valiant Mocenigo's arrival with a flotilla of eight Venetian galleys.¹⁴⁵

In March, 1395, when John de Kanizsa and his fellow envoys had appealed to the Senate to aid Sigismund's expedition against the Turks,

MHSM, IV, nos. DXXXIV–DXXXV, pp. 386–88. Mocenigo's commission as captain or captain-general of the Gulf is dated 17 February, 1396 (F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I [Paris and The Hague, 1958], no. 895, p. 210). See also Thiriet, I, no. 917, pp. 214–15, and especially Max Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem zur Zeit der Entstehung des türkischen Reiches nach venezianischen Quellen*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1923, pp. 146–49, 166–67 (Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, vol. 27).

¹⁴⁴ Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chap. 13 (Bonn, p. 51).

¹⁴⁵ G. M. Thomas, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II (1899, repr. 1965), no. 147, pp. 255–56; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. ix, nos. 40–41, pp. 241–42, and cf. nos. 56–58, p. 245; and Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 287–88, who erroneously believes there was a Christian fleet of “forty-four ships” operating in the area of Constantinople, on which cf. M. Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem* (1923), pp. 162–64, and see above, note 106. On the Venetian defense of Pera against the Turks “pour le bien commun des chrétiens,” see Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 919, p. 215, doc. dated 2 December, 1396. Mocenigo was later elected doge. His “testament” urging his fellow citizens to maintain their prosperity through peace and political restraint is famous (H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. von Venedig*, II [1920, repr. 1964], 276, 617–19).

Mocenigo's enterprise relaxed, but did not relieve the siege of Constantinople which, however intermittently, lasted for about eight years. Paul Gautier has recently published a contemporary account of the siege in “Un Récit inédit du siège de Constantinople par les Turcs (1394–1402),” *Revue des études byzantines*, XXIII (1965), 100–17. He gives a translation with the text. On the siege, see John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*, New Brunswick, N.J., 1969, esp. pp. 123–54, 202–18, 479–81. Bayazid raised the siege about the turn of the years 1401–1402 when he had to mobilize all his available forces against Timur, on which note Marie-Mathilde Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La Campagne de Timur en Anatolie (1402)*, Bucharest, 1942, pp. 46–47, 59, and G. T. Dennis, “Three Reports from Crete on the Situation in Romania, 1401–1402,” *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 243–65.

they had been reminded that Venice was at peace with the sultan, who treated their merchants well. Now the members of the Senate were beset with *displacentia et turbatio*, as they wrote Mocenigo, and some of them certainly regretted having allowed the state to assume an anti-Turkish stance by sending even four galleys to co-operate with Sigismund, “because every day and from hour to hour the news which we have had of the lord king of Hungary's defeat has been and is felt to be [ever] more grave and perilous for all Christendom and for our state.” What was done could not be undone. The Senate was willing, however, to have Mocenigo take some risk to save Constantinople (and indeed he had already done so), but for whatever reason on 31 October they rejected a proposal to report the complete failure of the crusade to the Roman pontiff Boniface IX “as the person on whom it is especially incumbent to make provision therefor.” The Senate also declined to send letters *de conflictu domini regis Hungarie* to the kings of France and England and to the emperor.¹⁴⁶ They could find out for themselves, and presently they would do so.

Strangely enough, it seems to have taken more than two months even for rumors of Nicopolis to reach the French court. Although Delaville Le Roulx says that “la nouvelle du désastre . . . s'était rapidement repandue jusqu' en France,” the first news of the sad event apparently did not get to France before

¹⁴⁶ Misti, Reg. 43, fol. 159^r, dated 31 October, 1396: “Quia non potest esse aliud quam utile pro tota Christianitate reddere informatum specialiter dominum papam de istis novis que habentur de conflictu domini regis Hungarie tamquam personam ad quam principaliter spectat superinde providere, vadit pars quod possint scribi littere ipsi domino pape, domino regi Francie, et Anglie, ac domino imperatori significando eis casum et de illo condolendo pro bono Christianitatis . . .,” but on the second vote the motion was defeated *de parte* 42, *de non* 60, *non sinceri* 11. The seriousness of the situation must have produced a gloomy atmosphere in the Senate, “quia omni die et de hora in horam novum quod habitum fuit de conflictu domini regis Hungarie sentitum est et sentitur esse gravior et periculosius pro tota Christianitate et pro statu nostro . . .” (*ibid.*). Albeit very cautiously, the Venetian Senate had taken various diplomatic as well as military measures against the Turks (Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, nos. 870, 882, 888, 891–92, 896, 900–901, 909, and 914). When Tommaso Mocenigo added the two armed galleys of Negroponte and the Aegean, plus the two galleys of the Tana-Trebizond run, to the four voted by the Senate, he had the flotilla of eight galleys with which he had relieved the Turkish pressure on Constantinople in late October, 1396 (cf. M. Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem* [1923], pp. 162–63).

the beginning of December. If it evoked disbelief, it also caused consternation. King Charles VI tried to squelch what the court regarded as unconfirmed reports derogatory of the French and Burgundian chivalry which could hardly be annihilated "par des hordes d'infidèles."¹⁴⁷ From 7 to 23 December (1396) a flood of letters went off to the doge and commune of Venice from Charles VI, Philip of Burgundy, Louis of Orléans, and Robert de Bar, requesting news of a rumored battle and soliciting assistance for John of Nevers and any French nobles who might find themselves in Venetian territory.¹⁴⁸ At the hour of nones on Christmas day, however, Jacques de Helly arrived in Paris, having been sent by both Bayazid and John of Nevers from Nicopolis, "où les crestiens franchois et de autres nations," he announced to king and court, "avoient esté tous mors ou prins, et de tout ce il apportoit certaines nouvelles."¹⁴⁹ Now they knew for sure of the destruction of the crusade and the crusaders; they knew who was killed and who was captured. Thus on 31 December Isabelle of Lorraine, the lady of Coucy and countess of Soissons, wrote the doge, imploring help to secure the release of her husband Enguerrand VII, whom the Turks held prisoner, and on the following day Louis of Orléans also addressed an emotional appeal to the Republic on behalf of John of Nevers, Henri de Bar, Coucy, and the other French nobles in Turkish hands.¹⁵⁰ A week later (on 9 January, 1397) the king decreed the observance in all the churches of Paris of the last rites for all who had lost their lives on the crusade, and other churches soon followed the example of those in the capital.¹⁵¹

Now there was nothing to be done except try to ransom John of Nevers and his princely companions from their Turkish captors. The

envoys whom Charles VI, Burgundy, and Orléans had sent to Venice informed the Senate that their instructions were not to return to France until they had seen the captives (*quod ipsi habent in mandatis a dominis suis non debendi repatriare nisi videant captivos suos*). The envoys asked for passage eastward. The Senate agreed to provide it (on 11 January, 1397), but advised them first to consult with King Sigismund of Hungary "since he is going to remain in Dalmatia for some time." Sigismund had already sent messengers into Serbia (*Rassia*) to find out what he could about the lot of Nevers and his unfortunate companions. He would give the envoys such information as he had, and by this time he must have heard from his messengers. He could also suggest the ways and means they might employ to visit the captives. The Senate would provide the envoys with a galley to take them to Sigismund, and would instruct the skipper to wait two or three days for them. The galley would take them as far as Ragusa or elsewhere along the Adriatic coast (*intra Culphum*), but it had been at sea too long to go as far as Constantinople. Another galley would be armed immediately. The Senate would send it on, to take them to the region of the Bosphorus in order that they might carry out the orders they had received from the king and the royal dukes of Burgundy and Orléans.¹⁵²

Within a month the armed galley was ready, and Guillaume de l'Aigle, the chief envoy, could embark for the island of Mytilene (Lesbos), where Francesco II Gattilusio, a cousin of Enguerrand de Coucy, would advise and assist him. From Mytilene the envoy proceeded to Mihalić (Karacabey), where Nevers and his followers were interned, two days west of Brusa (the Turkish Bursa), Bayazid's Anatolian capital. De l'Aigle brought with him, as gifts, saddles and harnesses of fine workmanship, and informed the sultan that ambassadors of high

¹⁴⁷ Froissart, XV, 331-32, and see Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 289-90.

¹⁴⁸ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 44-52, pp. 243-44, the full texts being given by Louis de Mas Latrie, *Commerce et expéditions militaires de la France et de Venise au moyen âge*, in *Mélanges historiques*, III (Paris, 1880), pp. 158-68 (Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France).

¹⁴⁹ Froissart, XV, 332-33, and cf. the *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chap. xxvi, pp. 597b-598a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chap. xxvii, pp. 243b-244a.

¹⁵⁰ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 53, 55, pp. 244-45; Mas Latrie, *Commerce et expéditions*, pp. 168-70.

¹⁵¹ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 523, and cf. Juvénal, *Hist. de Chas. VI*, p. 410a.

¹⁵² Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. DXLVII, p. 397, and cf. no. DXLIX, p. 401, doc. dated 28 January, 1397. In February papal nuncios were in Venice, having been sent by Boniface IX from Rome, trying to obtain assistance for Constantinople. The Senate informed them that the Republic had done everything possible, and was always "at open war [with the Turks] on the sea" (O. Halecki, "Rome et Byzance . . .," *Collectanea theologica*, XVIII [Lwów, 1937], 505-6). In the meantime the expected but disturbing news of Bayazid's designs upon Greece led the Senate to arm eight more galleys for service in the "Gulf" (Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 922, p. 215, doc. dated 12 January, 1397, and note nos. 923 ff.).

estate would soon come to wait upon him. He then returned as he had come, by way of the Aegean and the Adriatic to Venice, whence he left immediately for Paris, where he probably arrived in April (1397). In the meantime Jacques de Helly had gone back to Bayazid,¹⁵³ whom he found at Bolu 150 miles or more east of Brusa. Except for the ailing Coucy, for whom Francesco Gattilusio had interceded, Bayazid had taken the prisoners of Nicopolis with him to Bolu. He was willing to discuss the question of ransom, and readily granted Helly's request for safe-conducts for the ambassadors who were coming from France and Burgundy. The embassy was in fact already on its way, having set out on 20 January (1397). It was headed by Jean de Châteaumorand, whom we met on the Barbary crusade, Jean de Vergy, governor of Franche Comté, and Gilbert of Leuwerghem, governor of Flanders. They had set out for the Ottoman court with an extraordinary array of gifts, including a dozen white gerfalcons, falconers' gloves embroidered with pearls, gems, and Cypriote gold, saddles and harnesses, ten horses, harriers and hunting hounds, and tapestries from Arras depicting scenes from the life of Alexander the Great, from whom Bayazid claimed to be descended.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ Froissart, XV, 337, says that Helly remained in Paris "environ douze jours," in which case he began his return journey to Turkey on or about the feast of Epiphany (6 January, 1397).

¹⁵⁴ Châteaumorand and Leuwerghem made their way to Buda by way of Milan, where they enlisted the aid of Gian Galeazzo Visconti, who had some influence at the Ottoman court. Vergy headed straight for Buda, where he awaited his fellow ambassadors and Helly's delivery of the Turkish safe-conducts. According to Froissart, XV, 349, Sigismund objected to Châteaumorand's proceeding to Turkey with the tapestries and jewels which would be a permanent memorial of Bayazid's victory over the Christians. Sigismund is said, however, to have relaxed his opposition when Charles VI wrote in remonstrance and Philibert de Naillac, the master of Rhodes, interceded. Froissart says that Naillac was with Sigismund. But if Châteaumorand reached Buda sometime in March (1397), Sigismund was still somewhere in Dalmatia, and appears not to have returned to the Hungarian capital until May. Naillac was presumably still in Rhodes, where the Venetian galleys had left him.

There were various reasons why the Franco-Burgundian embassy should choose to go to Turkey by way of Buda (even if Sigismund was known not to be there), not the least of which would be the desire to avoid the long voyage around Cape Matapan in winter. On Helly, the embassy, and the gifts which Châteaumorand took to Bayazid, see Froissart, XV, 338–39, 343–52, 355–59; Brauner, *Schlacht bei Nikopolis*, pp. 59–60; Delaville Le Roulx, I, 300–6, and II, no. VIII, pp. 26–32; Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, pp.

During the months of their captivity John of Nevers and his companions had tried to bargain with Bayazid for their release. Before Châteaumorand had arrived in Buda on his way to Anatolia, the sultan allowed Marshal Boucicaut and Guy de la Trémoille to go to Rhodes to take steps toward raising the required ransom. La Trémoille died shortly after their arrival at Rhodes;¹⁵⁵ Boucicaut buried him in the church of S. John across the square from the grand master's palace. His body was later brought back to France for burial in the Chartreuse at Dijon. The hardships of imprisonment had apparently been too much for him, as they had already proved for Enguerrand de Coucy, who succumbed at Brusa on 18 February (1397), and whose heart was brought back for burial in the Celestine convent at Villeneuve, which he had founded near Nogent. Finally, in mid-June, when the ransom was being arranged and his fellow crusaders were soon to be released, Philippe d'Artois, the impetuous constable of France, died at Mihalić. He was interred in the Franciscan convent at Pera (Galata), where Clavijo saw his tombstone "in the choir before the high altar" in November, 1403. If we can believe Froissart, however, Philippe's body was also eventually returned to France "et ensévelé en l'église Saint-Laurent d'Eu, et là gist moult honnourablement."¹⁵⁶

102–4. For Enguerrand de Coucy's relationship to Francesco II Gattilusio, which baffled Delaville Le Roulx, see Wm. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, p. 320. The first Genoese lord of Mytilene, Francesco I, was killed on 6 August, 1384, together with his wife and two of his sons, in an earthquake which destroyed the castle he had built eleven years before (Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 318–19; Sp. P. Lampros, "Contribution to the History of the Ruling Gattilusio in Lesbos" [in Greek], in the *Néos Ἑλληνομνημίων*, VI [1909, repr. 1969], 39–40, and *ibid.*, VII [1910], 144–45, 343–44; Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane [1403–1406]*, trans. Guy Le Strange, New York and London, 1928, pp. 50–51). On Francesco II Gattilusio, his father, and his family, see also George T. Dennis, "The Short Chronicle of Lesbos, 1355–1428," in the Greek periodical *Lesbiaka*, V (Mytilene, 1965), 3–22 [pagination of an offprint].

¹⁵⁵ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxvii, p. 599a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxviii, p. 244b.

¹⁵⁶ Froissart, *Œuvres*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XVI (Brussels, 1872), 30–31 (on the death and burial of Coucy, concerning which see Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 313), 40 (on Philippe d'Artois), 51–52 (on La Trémoille, whose death is incorrectly placed in September, 1397, after Bayazid had released his prisoners, and they disembarked at Rhodes on their return voyage).

Froissart says that Philippe d'Artois died "à Haulte-Loge en Grèce" (presumably Altoluogo, Ephesus), but his

Death thus claimed three of the leaders of the crusade while they were still in the Levant, and a fourth, Henri de Bar, was to fall a victim to some contagious malady at Treviso in November (1397) after the captives' release and return to the west.¹⁵⁷

While in Rhodes, Boucicaut is said to have armed two galleys with which he sailed north to Mytilene, where the Genoese lord Francesco II Gattilusio received him hospitably and took to heart his plea on behalf of Nevers and the other captives "que il les voulust secourir de certaine finance, et que bonne seureté luy en seroit faicte." Francesco and some of the rich merchants loaned him 30,000 francs. At his accession in August, 1384, Francesco, born Jacopo, had taken the name of his father, who had become famous in the Levant by helping to restore John V Palaeologus to the Byzantine throne, for which he had received the lordship of Mytilene and the hand of John's sister Maria. Francesco's uncle Niccolò Gattilusio, who had held the barony of Aenos at the mouth of the Maritsa for some years, made Boucicaut a further loan of 2,000 ducats, and sent the captives "les grans et beaux dons" of fish, bread, and sugar, to which Niccolò's wife added linen and other cloth, for all of which about two weeks later Nevers and Henri de Bar were to send their thanks in a note dated at Mihalić on 15 April (1397) "to our very dear and special friend, the lord of Aenos."¹⁵⁸

With the money in hand Boucicaut hastened back to Mihalić, where he obviously arrived before 15 April. Nevers and his companions were overjoyed to see him as well as the money with which they could relieve some of their

most pressing wants. Then, as had been previously agreed upon, Boucicaut presented himself to Bayazid, paid his own ransom with the remaining funds, "et fut quitte de sa prison." He was free to go wherever he wished. He preferred of course to remain with Nevers and his friends and to serve as mediator between them and the hard-headed sultan. It was a worrisome task, "car Bajazet ne sçavoit que faire de les faire tous mourir ou de les mettre à rançon." Boucicaut's biographer says the sultan feared that, if he let his captives go, they would return to France, assemble a great host, and return to seek vengeance "pour laquelle cause pourroit luy et son pays estre destruit." The marshal explained that by releasing the captives the sultan would gain "great friendships in France" as well as many gifts and much money. If he held them by force, however, or dealt with them unreasonably, all the Christian princes in Europe would unite against the Turks for love of the king of France, and Bayazid would be destroyed: "such words well and wisely did the marshal say unto him." Boucicaut was so persuasive, according to his biographer, that Bayazid came to prefer ransom to ruination, but he set the figure for the release of his prisoners at a million francs. By this time Boucicaut had learned how to deal with him, and so *petit à petit* he finally got the sum reduced to 150,000 francs, provided Nevers and the other French lords would swear never again to take up arms against him. The oaths were duly taken, but it was not necessary (we are told) to observe them very long, "car assez tost après mourut Bajazet."¹⁵⁹

tombstone, which still existed in 1647, not 1747, records his death as occurring "in Micalici MCCCCLXXXVII die XV Iunii," on which see I. Bullialdus's notes on Ducas, *Hist. byzantina* (Bonn, pp. 559–60); Delaville Le Roulx, I, 314, who is inaccurate; Kervyn, XVI, 256; *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxvii, p. 600a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxviii, p. 245b; and Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane*, trans. G. Le Strange, p. 93.

¹⁵⁷ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxvii, p. 600, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxviii, p. 246a; Froissart, XVI, 60, who says that Henri de Bar died in an epidemic (of cholera, typhoid, the plague?) which lasted until the feast of S. Andrew on 30 November, "laquele mortalité abatit et occist du poeuple sans nombre;" Delaville Le Roulx, I, 318.

¹⁵⁸ The text is given in Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, II, no. viii, p. 33, and on the Gattilusio, see the article by George Dennis, referred to above, in *Lesbiaka*, V (1965).

¹⁵⁹ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxvii, pp. 598b–599b, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxviii, pp. 244b–245b, the quoted phrases being taken from the latter text. By a slip of the pen Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 308, says that Boucicaut obtained a loan of 36,000 francs from Francesco Gattilusio, an error in which Atiya, *Crusade of Nicopolis*, p. 105, has followed him.

For our present purpose we need not distinguish among francs, florins, and ducats. In the late fourteenth century there were two gold coins called francs, the *franc à cheval* (3.88 grams) and the *franc à pied* (3.82 grs.), so called because in the one case the king was shown mounted (on the obverse) and in the other on foot. Both were of fine gold, and each was worth a *livre* or twenty *sols*. The Florentine florin (3.53 grs.) and the Venetian ducat (3.56 grs.) had a wider currency, but about the same value. See Karl Heinrich Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.*, Paderborn, 1911, pp. 51–52, 53–54, 62–63, and Friedrich von Schrötter, *Wörterbuch der*

As usual one requires caution in dealing with the chroniclers. Marshal Boucicaut's biographer has obviously written a eulogy. His work had a restricted circulation, and apparently survives in a single manuscript (in Paris).¹⁶⁰ He certainly knew Boucicaut well, and may conceivably have been his chaplain Honorat Durand. If his account of the marshal's negotiations with Bayazid contains exaggerations, it is at least *ben trovato*. Two years later, however, Boucicaut was to lead an expeditionary force to break the Turks' resumption of the siege of Constantinople (in 1399). If his biographer's account is accurate, therefore, Boucicaut broke his word to the sultan although Delaville Le Roulx believes that French knights did not break "leurs serments les plus solennels." Nevertheless, Bayazid presumably did require Nevers and his other prisoners to swear "par tous les sermens de sa loy" that they would not attack him again, despite Froissart's explicit assertion to the contrary,¹⁶¹ although any canon lawyer of the time would have assured Boucicaut and those who sailed with him in 1399 that an oath given under duress to an infidel was worthless. Jean de Vienne had been killed at Nicopolis; Coucy died at Brusa and de la Trémoille at Rhodes. It was probably beneath Nevers's dignity to haggle with the Turks over the price of his release. Boucicaut was clearly the most resourceful of the forlorn group of Christian nobles at Mihalić.

The duke and duchess of Burgundy had consulted the Lucchese merchant Dino (Jodino) Rapondi, who was known in France as Digne Responde, on the troublesome question of raising a ransom for their son and the other French nobles. Rapondi was one of the chief financiers of his time, a banker and purveyor of Italian and Levantine goods to the courts of France and Burgundy, with offices in Paris,

Bruges, and Montpellier. He wrote to a Genoese associate, Bartolommeo Pellegrino of Chios, who had made a fortune in the alum of New Phocaea (Foglia Nuova) and in the mastic of Chios. Pellegrino was known to Bayazid, and could help prepare the way for the ambassadors Châteaumorand, Vergy, and Leuwerghem on their way to Mihalić. Froissart says that James I of Cyprus, whom he accuses of murdering his brother Peter I (in 1369), also entered the scene. James was anxious to curry favor with the Genoese, who were the paramount power in Cyprus, and with the French, who were taking over the city of Genoa itself. To soften Bayazid's wrath and to persuade him "descendre à amiable composition," James sent him a golden ship's model (according to Froissart) worth some 20,000 ducats. In view of the state of the Cypriote treasury, this seems unlikely although, when Nevers was released, James did loan him 15,000 gold florins (on 24 June, 1397).¹⁶² It is quite possible that Boucicaut had been acting as Nevers's go-between with Bayazid, and had even secured the latter's agreement to a ransom of 150,000 francs, before the arrival of the Franco-Burgundian embassy. The richness of the gifts which Châteaumorand and his confrères brought and the alacrity with which the Genoese seemed to be responding to Nevers's need may have caused Bayazid to raise his sights. In any event a settlement was reached before the middle of June, and Froissart places the ransom at 200,000 ducats for the "twenty-five lords" still in captivity.¹⁶³

The documents bear out Froissart. John of Nevers paid the sultan 28,000 florins as soon as the negotiations had produced agreement on the amount. He borrowed the money from Jean de Lusignan, titular lord of Beirut, nephew and councillor of James I of Cyprus, and from Brancalone Grillo and Nicholas Matharas, both residents of Pera. A balance of 172,000 florins

Münzkunde, Berlin and Leipzig, pp. 167 [Dukat], 201–2 [Franc], 228 [Goldgulden]. Note also the extract from the accounts of Oudot Douay, *maître des comptes* of the Burgundian court at Dijon, with reference to the ransoming of Nevers (Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxiii, p. 87): "... en estimant le ducat vingt sols, la livre et le franc de mesme."

¹⁶⁰ Henri Omont and C. Couderc, *Catalogue général des manuscrits français de la Bibliothèque Nationale: Ancien Supplément français*, II (Paris, 1896), no. 11,432, p. 301. It is a parchment manuscript of the fifteenth century, "Explicit le livre des fais du bon mareschal Bouciquaut . . . fait et accompli jusques icy, le 1x^e jour d' avril l'an de grace mil cccc et ix."

¹⁶¹ Froissart, XVI, 47.

¹⁶² Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 311, 323, note 2. Rapondi died at Bruges in 1414 or 1415. Some idea of his wealth may be got from his will dated at Paris on 24 February, 1413, and published by Alexandre Tuetey, "Testaments enregistrés au parlement de Paris sous le règne de Charles VI," *Mélanges historiques*, III (Paris, 1880), 553–62 (Docs. inédits sur l'histoire de France). At the time of Peter I's murder his brother James was constable of "Jerusalem" (cf. Sir George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, II [1948], 365–68).

¹⁶³ Froissart, XVI, 29 ff., 40: "... la rédemption des vingt-et-cinq seigneurs fut mise à somme, et deubt avoir le roy Basaach deux cens mille ducas."

remained, which Bayazid apparently insisted be paid within eight months from the date of the agreement (24 June, 1397). A Genoese, Ansaldo Spinola, acting as proxy for Francesco II Gattilusio of Mytilene, guaranteed the payment of 110,000 florins. Niccolò Grillo (Grisle), acting for Francesco's uncle Niccolò, lord of Aenos, undertook to provide 40,000 florins. The remainder due Bayazid amounted to 22,000 florins. Gaspare de' Pagani, *mercator . . . villae Peyrae*, and Niccolò Paterio, the Genoese podestà of New Phocaea, each agreed to furnish 11,000 florins, thus making up the required 200,000.

According to a formal instrument executed at Mihalić on 24 June, John of Nevers, Henri de Bar, and Jacques de Bourbon, count of La Marche, solemnly swore on the four gospels to pay Bayazid directly or to repay the guarantors of the sums specified. They would effect the clearance of their debts in Venice, where they expected to receive the money then being collected in Philip the Bold's domains. Once they had reached Venice, they would not in fact leave the lagoon (they said) until they had met their obligations to the sultan or to the Gattilusio, Pagani, and Paterio. As further warranty of payment for the 172,000 florins which the guarantors were obviously going to have to produce, Boucicaut, Vergy, Leuwerghem, Châteaumorand, and Colard des Armoires (representing the duke of Bar) also attached their seals to the instrument.¹⁶⁴ Boucicaut's name stands first in the list of *ambaxatores*, and seems to confirm his biographer's account of the prominent role he played in arranging for the ransom.

The transactions of June, 1397, ended nine months of captivity, hardship, and anxiety for the losers at Nicopolis. The Franco-Burgundian ambassadors came back home as quickly as they could. Leuwerghem, however, died as they began the return voyage, even before they reached Mytilene. The news of the prisoners' release from their confinement at Mihalić was brought to the French court on 28 August by a member of Vergy's suite who had hurried on to Paris.¹⁶⁵ Nevers and his companions

returned in more leisurely fashion, spending six weeks on the island of Mytilene (5 July to 15 August, 1397), where Francesco II Gattilusio welcomed them with chivalric courtesy and his wife, "la dame de Matelin," provided them with fresh linen and vestments of fine Damascene weave. Their protracted stay on the island probably had something to do with an extraordinary proposal which Francesco made them.

On 15 July, 1397, during the crusaders' residence at Mytilene, John VII Palaeologus, nephew and hostile rival of the Emperor Manuel II, sent Francesco Gattilusio full *auctoritas et baillia* to treat with John of Nevers and Henri de Bar, who might convey his "imperial faith and word" to Charles VI in France. If Charles would come himself or send some member of his family with another strong army "ad partes Romanie," Francesco undertook to see that John VII would surrender in perpetuity all his rights and claims to the "said empire of Romania." There was of course an important proviso, namely "that the said royal Majesty will give and assign to the said lord emperor [John VII] for himself and his heirs . . . in the kingdom of France the sum of 25,000 gold florins as an annual and perpetual revenue . . . as well as . . . a castle, for him to take up residence in the kingdom within the next three years. . . ." On 15 August, as they got ready to leave the island, Nevers and Bar received Francesco's procuration to present John VII's offer to the king of France, and stated that they would urge Charles to accept it (*sicut decet, laborabimus nostro posse*). They also promised to inform Francesco of his decision before the end of April (1398); otherwise it was agreed that John VII's offer would be null and void, "and as if there had never been any talk of it."¹⁶⁶ Of course nothing was to come of

Burgundy that Bayazid had freed the captives, and that they had arrived at Mytilene, for which encouraging news the doge received letters of thanks dated at Paris on 15 and 19 September, 1397 (Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 67–68, p. 247).

¹⁶⁶ Sp. P. Lampros, "John VII Palaeologus's Offer of the Rights to the Byzantine Empire to Charles VI, the king of France" (in Greek), *Néos Ἑλληνομνημύων*, X (1913), 248–57, gives the text of the Latin document, dated at Mytilene on 15 August, 1397 (from the Archives de la Côte d'Or, B 11, 396), with a brief commentary. John VII had married the daughter of Francesco II Gattilusio. See also Peter Wirth, "Zum Geschichtsbild Kaiser Johannes' VII. Palaiologos," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), 594 ff. On 1 July, 1397, Manuel II had written Charles VI thanking him for

¹⁶⁴ The text has been published by Kervyn, in his notes to Froissart, XVI, 261–63, "datum Micalici in Turchia die XXIIII mensis iunii anno Domini MCCC nonag. VII." See also Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 311–12, and II, nos. x, xxiii, pp. 34–35, 87 ff.

¹⁶⁵ Froissart, XVI, 42, and Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, I, 314–15. The doge of Venice, Antonio Venier, had also informed Charles VI of France and Philip of

this strange offer, but it is important to note that, even as they licked their wounds, Nevers and Bar were willing to urge the king of France to send another army into the Balkans to oppose the Turks on behalf of the embattled Byzantines.

While Nevers, Bar, and Francesco II were discussing John VII's proposed cession of his imperial claims, two Hospitaller galleys came from Rhodes about 9 August to convey the crusaders to the Knights' stronghold. On the tenth Nevers gave written acknowledgment to Frère Dominique d'Allemagne, commander of the Hospital at Naples, for 29,261 ducats, the value of the jewels and gold and silver plate, which various members of the Order had pledged as a loan "pour mettre en gage à Baizat pour le premier paiement de la raenson."¹⁶⁷

Since Nevers had given Bayazid the 28,000 florins he had borrowed from Jean de Lusignan, Brancaleone Grillo, and Nicholas Matharas plus the 15,000 he had received from James I of Cyprus, the addition of the 29,261 ducats from the Hospitallers to the "first payment" of the ransom would suggest that the sultan had got some 72,261 florins (or ducats) in very short order.¹⁶⁸ Since the records are rather fragmentary, exact figures are difficult to determine. Among the prisoners whom Bayazid held at Brusa (Bursa) there were several Hungarian barons, including Eustace of Illsua, palatine of the kingdom. Their share of the ransom was

the assistance the crusaders had rendered the year before; he emphasized the danger to which all Christendom would be exposed if the Turks should take Constantinople, and he asked for further help to ward off such a catastrophe (Franz Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, pt. 5 [Munich and Berlin, 1965], no. 3269, p. 85, and cf. nos. 3270 ff.).

¹⁶⁷ Delaville Le Roulx, *France en Orient*, II, no. xiv, pp. 43–45, and cf. Froissart, XVI, 51, "trente mille fran[c]s." On Dominique d'Allemagne, as he appears in the French sources, Dominicus de Alamania in Latin, see J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes (1310–1421)*, Paris, 1913, repr. London, 1974, *passim*, and esp. pp. 190–91, note 3, and cf. Anthony Luttrell, "Aldobrando Baroncelli in Greece, 1378–1382," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXXVI (1970), 273–300, and esp. p. 281, note 3. Despite the name by which he is commonly known, Dominique seems to have been a Bolognese, and is referred to in a letter of King Pedro IV of Aragon as "Dominicus de Bolunya, bajulus dela Morea" (Ant. Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947 [1948], doc. CDLXVII, p. 532, dated April, 1381).

¹⁶⁸ For the Hospitallers' loan to Nevers, see the document dated 10 August, 1397, in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xiv, pp. 43–45.

set at 50,000 ducats which, *liberaliter et diligenter*, Nevers had undertaken to pay. Francesco and Niccolò Gattilusio had advanced the money, and a few months later (on 1 October, 1397) various prominent members of the Hungarian feudality promised to reimburse Nevers, once the prisoners were freed.¹⁶⁹

As titular leader of the host Nevers was assuming the whole burden of the ransom, which public opinion probably required him to do. Philip the Bold of Burgundy was in a financial quandary. Pomp and prodigality were the hallmarks of the Burgundian court, and knightly extravagance had almost exhausted his treasury. The Nicopolis campaign had consumed huge sums. Costly embassies had gone back and forth, and the crusaders' return voyage would be expensive. Nevers had to live and travel in the fashion required of his exalted station, and he was borrowing money left and right to do so. In the meantime Bayazid was awaiting the "second payment" for which Philip and his councillors had to find the funds.

Nevers, Boucicaut, and the French knights spent a long time on Rhodes, says Froissart, "pour eulx raffreschir," and to await the Venetian galleys which would take them to the Veneto, where they were to remain until their creditors had been paid. La Trémoille died at Rhodes, as we have seen, and they buried him "moult révéramment." When the galleys came, Nevers and the rest took grateful leave of the Hospitallers. The Venetian skippers adjusted the voyage to the convenience of their noble passengers, stopping more often than was their wont to let them go ashore and "pour monstrier au conte de Nevers les ysles et les terres qui sont entre Venise et Roddes." They landed at the Venetian port of Modon, and after another break at Glarentza went on to Cephalonia, where the ladies greeted the "lords of France" with great joy. The ladies were delighted to receive guests of such eminence and high estate, for mostly their visitors were merchants from Venice and Genoa, whose company was less exciting. After five days at Cephalonia the galleys sailed on to Corfu, north to Ragusa, and finally to Parenzo (Poreč), where according to Froissart the "grosses naves et gallées" put in, because they drew too much water to go directly into Venice. Froissart is often misinformed. Galleys and transports entered the Bacino daily. He had a

¹⁶⁹ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xvi, pp. 47–48.

foggy notion of the map, and mixes up the sequence of the flotilla's various ports of call. He also fails to mention the landing at Capodistria (Koper) where on 8 October, 1397, Nevers and Jacques de Bourbon made a declaration of their indebtedness to the Venetian Signoria for a loan of 15,000 gold ducats, giving an oath that they would not leave the territory of the Republic until they had repaid the debt.¹⁷⁰

It was probably at Capodistria, the *caput Istriae*, and not at Parenzo, that the French re-embarked (if they did) in "petis vaisseaulx passagers" for Venice, where they were welcomed with the usual enthusiasm. Upon reaching their destination, they gave abundant thanks to God for their deliverance from the hands of the sultan "Amourath-Bacquin et des mescroians," for at times they had believed themselves to be utterly lost. Nevers, "qui souverain estoit de tous," found some of his servitors waiting for him at Venice. The duke and duchess had sent them on, in anticipation of his coming. At Venice the erstwhile crusaders kept clerks busy writing letters which couriers and varlets carried off to France and elsewhere, notifying family and friends of their safe arrival in the city. The duke and duchess of Burgundy ordered gold and silver plate, tapestries, and clothes to be sent to their son. The families of the other lords did likewise, "and you can well believe and understand that all this was done at great cost . . . , for in truth nothing was spared, and furthermore they lived à grans despens, for Venice is one of the most expensive cities in the world for strangers." In the meantime the "sire Dinde Responde" had already arrived, and had passed some time there, because of the question of money, "for without him one could do nothing."¹⁷¹

Actually Dino Rapondi had delayed his departure for Venice until the French lords had reached the lagoon, where they encountered "une mortalité très-grande et très-perilleuse en la cité de Venise et là environ." The plague, if it was the plague, had begun the first week in August. It lasted until the end of November, and (we have noted the fact) it carried off Henri de Bar, Coucy's son-in-law and heir. Nevers and his companions removed themselves to Treviso, where he at least was lodged "en ung moult bel hostel, et y fut plus de

quatre mois," says Froissart, adding a full month to the time Nevers remained at Treviso. His expenses were high, as suggested by the accounts of Oudot Douay, the *maître des comptes* of Duke Philip at Dijon. Douay had been sent to join Nevers and Rapondi at Venice. Although the twenty-second and twenty-third of November (1397) may have involved unusual expenses, since Douay has recorded them separately, the entries for the two days probably show what Nevers's expenses frequently were: "On 22 November milord the count of Nevers dined at Treviso and slept at Conegliano. The expenditure for him and his people was 355 livres, 20 deniers. On Friday, 23 November, milord the count spent all day at Conegliano, and his household at Treviso: [the expenditure was] 173 livres, 13 sols, 8 deniers."¹⁷²

The expenses continued from day to day; the loans carried penalties for default of payment; and Nevers borrowed more money. On 20 January, 1398, he acknowledged his indebtedness to the Hospitaller Dominique d'Allemagne for another "fifteen thousand ducats of gold of the coinage of Venice, of good and just weight, for the just and fair loan made to us . . . by the said Frère Dominique in our very great need and at our request."¹⁷³ Payment of the ransom had to be dealt with, however, and Froissart, who collected the gossip of the day, says that although the ransom amounted to "only 200,000 florins, considering all the costs . . . , one could well add another 200,000."¹⁷⁴ Making every allowance for popular exaggeration of the figure, the Burgundian court had a problem of depressing magnitude.

According to Oudot Douay's accounts, 146,047 livres (or francs or ducats) were collected at Venice before the end of January, 1398, by which time Nevers and his companions had left Treviso for home. Of this sum the merchant-banker Dino Rapondi, *bourgeois de Paris*, provided *lettres de change* amounting to 131,668 livres (or francs or ducats), for on the fifteenth of the month he gave Douay a letter of exchange for 53,333 *écus d'or*, worth 60,000 francs (or ducats), and on the twenty-fifth another such letter for 71,668, *lesdiz ducas évalués vingt sols*

¹⁷⁰ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, no. 70, pp. 247-48.

¹⁷¹ Froissart, XVI, 48-57.

¹⁷² Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XXIII, p. 88.

¹⁷³ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xv, p. 46.

¹⁷⁴ Froissart, XVI, 58, 60-61, which is presumably the source of the similar estimate given by Delaville Le Roulx, I, 322-23.

pièce. Quite apart from these sums Nevers had been contracting debts on his own, two of which we have already recorded—15,000 ducats from Frère Dominique, 15,000 from the Signoria of Venice, 5,000 from Bernardo Paterio, brother of the podestà of Pera, 5,000 from Battista Argenti of Pera, 6,000 from Antonio della Rocca, 3,000 from Costantino Lercari, and 4,000 from another Genoese, who appears in Douay's accounts as "Allevan de la Mer"—making a total of 53,000 ducats,¹⁷⁵ which presumably paid the expenses of the French at Venice, Treviso, and Conegliano, and settled some of Nevers's more pressing bills.

The duke and duchess of Burgundy had sent Rapondi to Venice, as Froissart says, "car sans luy on ne povoit riens faire."¹⁷⁶ Rapondi's response to the needs of Burgundy might have been more restrained, however, had it not been for the generous gesture of King Sigismund of Hungary, who had offered to pay half the ransom for the Nicopolis crusaders. As usual Sigismund had no money, but he was still receiving from the Venetians every year on the feast of S. Stephen in August the indemnity or "tribute" (*census seu datia*) of 7,000 ducats which, as we saw in an earlier chapter, his predecessor Louis the Great had been accorded in the treaty of Turin (of 8 August, 1381). Incidentally, we should state that the Venetians always strenuously denied that they were ever the *censuarii* of any other power—as the Neapolitan kings were supposed to be *censuarii* of the Holy See—but we may use the term *census* in the general sense of a financial payment without implying any political or juridical suzerainty as inhering in the Hungarian crown. For his half of the ransom, Sigismund proposed to use this *census* or indemnity, which would amount to 100,000 ducats in about fourteen years. Rapondi agreed to "purchase and acquire" the *census* for this sum, which in Nevers's words would then be employed "for our ransom and that of certain other French lords." Sigismund could recover his rights to the Venetian *census* by repaying Rapondi for the advance thus made to Nevers, who at Treviso on 15 and 16 January, 1398, subscribed to letters setting forth the details of the arrangement,¹⁷⁷ which the king himself

confirmed the following June at Požegi in southern Hungary.¹⁷⁸

As a result of Rapondi's intercession the Venetian government granted Nevers, Jacques de Bourbon, and the others permission to leave Treviso and return home in January, 1398. Once more Nevers and Bourbon acknowledged their indebtedness to the doge and commune for 15,000 ducats, which they solemnly promised to repay within six months.¹⁷⁹ Nevers, Bourbon, Boucicaut, and the French lords left Treviso on 23 January, proceeded north to Conegliano, and reached Burgundy by way of the Austrian Tyrol and Switzerland. Their route can be followed day by day from Oudot Douay's accounts. On 31 January we find them at Innsbruck, on 19 February at Besançon, and on the twenty-third at Dijon, where Nevers received gifts and a reverential welcome. At his father's request, Nevers went to Paris, where he arrived on the evening of 10 March. Charles VI gave him 20,000 livres. He left Paris by Le Bourget on the fourteenth, and on the evening of the sixteenth arrived at Arras, where his mother Margaret awaited him. Douay's accounts locate him at Courtrai on the twentieth and at Oudenarde on the following day. He rejoined his father at Ghent on the twenty-second, and a week later (on 30 March) they entered Bruges together with a company of 500 horse.¹⁸⁰ Acclaimed everywhere as heroic defenders of the faith, they returned in triumph from one of the greatest defeats of the century.

Amid the universal rejoicing at the safe return of Nevers and the proud nobles of his company there was one, a lonely old man in Paris, who was grieving over the inevitable consequences of the defeat at Nicopolis. And inevitable they would be, he said, if Europe did not resume the crusade and, with the king of France at the head of a well-disciplined host, avenge the disaster and stamp out the

¹⁷⁵ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxiii, pp. 87–88, and see, *ibid.*, pp. 91–95, for Douay's payments to various creditors.

¹⁷⁶ Froissart, XVI, 56, 57.

¹⁷⁷ Fejér, *Codex diplomaticus*, X-2 (1834), nos. CCLXIV–CCLXV, pp. 478–83, dated 15–16 January, 1398 (Ven. style

1397), and cf. Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xi, p. 36, and Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem*, pp. 153–54, 169–70.

¹⁷⁸ Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, no. DLXIII, p. 413; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, no. 116, pp. 259–60; Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xi, pp. 36–37. Sigismund assigned the right to collect the Venetian *census* to Jean de Hangest and Rénier Pot as agents for Nevers and Rapondi on 13 June, 1398, "in civitate nostra Passagana." Cf. the notes of Kervyn de Lettenhove in his edition of Froissart, XVI, 269–70.

¹⁷⁹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 78–80, pp. 249–50, dated 20 January, 1398.

¹⁸⁰ Delaville Le Roulx, I, 318–20, and II, no. xxiii, pp. 88–90.

shame. Philippe de Mézières was then living in the convent of the Celestines off the Rue St.-Antoine. Immediately after receiving the sad news from the east he had composed his last work (in January and February, 1397), *L'Épître lamentable et consolatoire sur le fait de la desconfiture lacrimable de Nicopoli*, addressed to Philip of Burgundy "and to all the kings, princes, barons, knights, and cities of Catholic Christendom." According to Mézières the results of the crusade might have been different if the Catholic Hungarians, French, Germans, English, and "some Italians" had not fought alongside of the schismatic Bosnians, Serbs, Vlachs, and Bulgarians. The religious division had created disunion and spread disorder in the Christian ranks. The schismatics had already submitted to the "seignourie" of the tyrant Bayazid, and such was their hatred of the Latins "that in my opinion it can well be they prefer to be subjects of the Turk rather than of the king of Hungary."

The blow which Philip had received in his son's defeat and capture had been felt by all the Christian princes and peoples. He was not alone. Mézières reminded him of the painful trials of "nostre mère Sainte-Église," the shipwreck of Sigismund's hopes for the crusade, and the desolation of Hungary. After thirty years' experience of Turks and Saracens, Mézières knew them to be cruel and treacherous. He could hardly not recommend ransoming the prisoners, and yet the money which Bayazid would thus receive would provide him with the "matère et occasion" to seize more Christian kingdoms. In any event those who were to negotiate the ransom should not be French, "mais vénitiens ou merchants d'Italie." He distrusted the profit-seeking merchants, some of whom were friends of the Turks and would sell their own fathers for a good price. Nevertheless, there were reliable merchants. They were accustomed to dealing with the Turks, and would secure better terms for the ransom. Mézières would also have Philip and the other princes bear in mind the well-known proverb that when one sees his neighbor's house on fire, he should be on the alert and not feel sure of his own.¹⁸¹ The fires in Hungary could spread westward.

The thought might arise in a suspicious

¹⁸¹ *L'Épître lamentable et consolatoire*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, in his edition of Froissart, XVI, 452-53, 455-56, 477-81: "Qui voit la maison de son voisin ardoir,

mind that Sigismund was giving up the Venetian *census* because he believed it likely that Venice would soon discontinue the payment. At Spalato the year before (on 4 January, 1397) he had awarded a lifetime annuity of 1,000 ducats from the *census* to Tommaso Mocenigo, then captain-general of the Gulf, whose galleys had carried him and his retinue from the Bosphorus to the Dalmatian coast. Mocenigo had shown unusual valor in defending Constantinople against the Turks, and had helped prevent Sigismund's own capture.¹⁸² The Venetian Senate did not interfere with this assignment of funds to Mocenigo, but some time later (on 27 August, 1399) Mocenigo declared himself agreeable to the Signoria's not paying him the annuity for 1398 and 1399 until John of Nevers should have repaid the 15,000 ducats he had borrowed from Venice, provided restitution were made when payments were resumed to Sigismund.¹⁸³

A week later, on 4 September, the Doge Antonio Venier wrote Philip of Burgundy that the Signoria was deducting 5,000 ducats from the 7,000 due Sigismund for the year, as one-third payment of the 15,000 which Nevers had borrowed, and was turning the other 2,000 over to Mocenigo to provide for his annuity for the past two years. The doge also asked for the payment of Nevers's balance of 10,000 as soon as possible.¹⁸⁴ Rapondi was notified of this action on the same date.¹⁸⁵ Presently the Venetian government received a letter from Sigismund, dated at Gran on 15 August, requesting payment to Rapondi and his agents of the 7,000 ducats for the year 1399, to which the doge replied on 12 September that only 5,000 could be paid to Rapondi, because Mocenigo had already received 2,000.¹⁸⁶

il doit veillier et non estre assurez de la sienne" (p. 456). It is interesting to note that Mézières, who had received his information "par la relation de ceuls qui se trouvèrent à la journée lacrimable" (p. 452), says that there were English at Nicopolis, which Tipton, *Speculum*, XXXVII (1962), 528-40, believes was not the case.

¹⁸² Cf. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 56-58, p. 245.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, III, bk. IX, no. 163, p. 270.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, III, bk. IX, no. 164, p. 270, and Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XIII, pp. 41-42.

¹⁸⁵ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. IX, no. 165, p. 270.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, III, bk. IX, nos. 161, 166, p. 270, according to Predelli's summary of the doge's letter to the effect that "non furono pagati che 5,000 ducati al Rapondi. . . ." Cf. Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. DLXXVII-DLXXVIII, DXCI, pp. 420, 426-27, and M. Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem*, pp. 153-54, 169-70.

It will soon become clear from later documents, however, that Venice must have "paid" Rapondi by giving him a quittance for 5,000 ducats, informing him at the same time that Nevers's debt had thus been reduced by one-third. This was not what Rapondi had expected, but the Venetian action was entirely justifiable. The Burgundians had reason to assume that the Senate was going along with Sigismund's assignment of the *census* to the payment of Nevers's ransom. As long as Sigismund had a right to the money, what difference did it make to the Senate what he did with it? Difficulties would arise, of course, if and when the Venetians should decide that Sigismund was no longer entitled to receipt of the 7,000 ducats a year.

It was going to take a long time to get much from the Venetian *census*, and the needs of the Burgundian court were urgent. From the first news of his son's capture Philip of Burgundy had realized that his own states would have to provide most of the funds he needed for the ransom and the other expenses in which the crusade had involved him. In August, 1397, an "aid" or *taille* was levied on the cities of Flanders for 100,000 nobles "senz les . . . gens d'égglise," the Flemish clergy making a separate contribution of 7,194 nobles.¹⁸⁷ An especial burden fell on Flanders, says Froissart, "où il redonde et habonde moult de finances pour le fait de la marchandise."¹⁸⁸ But of course the aid was levied and collected everywhere in Philip's domains—50,000 francs in the duchy of Burgundy and 30,000 livres in the county, 16,352 livres in the county of Artois, 10,000 francs in the county of Nevers and the barony of Donzy, 8,000 livres in the castellany of Lille, and 5,000 francs in the county of Charolais. Smaller sums were exacted in less prosperous and less populous areas.

When the estates of Brabant assembled in Brussels to consider the Burgundian request for a subsidy, however, they expressed regret that they could not help Philip to meet the costs of "la doloureuse aventure." Although the duchess Jeanne intervened on Philip's behalf, the estates declined the appeal, owing to their poverty (they said) and to the heavy charges which had recently been laid upon them.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xvii, pp. 49–58. On the gold noble (about 7.97 grams), see F. von Schrötter, *Wörterbuch d. Münzkunde* (1930), p. 460.

¹⁸⁸ Froissart, XVI, 58.

¹⁸⁹ Froissart, XVI, 58–59, 264–69, where the Brabançons' letter of 5 April to Philip of Burgundy is given; Delaville Le

Brabant had not yet come under Burgundian rule. Philip raised 20,000 francs by pawning his gold plate, and made further overtures to the estates of Burgundy, from which he received another 12,000 francs (making a total of 62,000) and to the estates of Charolais, which gave him 2,000 more. These latter grants were collected on the feast of S. John (24 June) and at All Saints (1 November) in the year 1400.¹⁹⁰

Philip had to pay out money as fast as he raised it. He also continued to spend it. As he was pressing Burgundy and Charolais to increase their grants, his creditors were pressing him. In October, 1400, envoys of Francesco II and Niccolò Gattilusio appeared at the Burgundian court, asking for payment of the monies still due their principals. Francesco had advanced 110,000 ducats, as we know, and Niccolò 40,000, making a total of 150,000, of which only 75,000 had been paid. In addition to the unpaid balance of 75,000 ducats, the Burgundian court is said to have owed Niccolò 5,000 for another loan he had made to John of Nevers as well as 8,500 for the ransom of Guy de la Trémoille (who had died at Rhodes in April, 1397). The Gattilusio also claimed 20,000 ducats for expenses, interest, and damages; they had sent several embassies to Turkey as well as to France and Burgundy. The total of the Burgundian arrears thus amounted to 108,500 ducats, of which only 7,000 had been paid. Gaspare de' Pagni and Niccolò Paterio had been *respondeurs* for 22,000 ducats, which (the envoys said) had nothing to do with the two Gattilusio, but they now wanted payment of 101,500 ducats as still due milords of Mytilene and Aenos.¹⁹¹

It is not surprising that the costs of Nicopolis as well as the bloodshed should have lessened the crusading ardor of the French. Bayazid was more powerful than ever, Constantinople more threatened. Desperate for aid from the west, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II had

Roulx, I, 325–26, who mistakenly identifies the duchess Jeanne, daughter of Duke John III of Brabant, as Philip's sister. Although the Brabançons' letter speaks of "madame de Brabant, vostre suer," the reference is merely an expression of courtesy.

¹⁹⁰ Delaville Le Roulx, I, 326–27, with refs. to the French archival sources, and see R. Vaughan, *Philip the Bold* (1962), pp. 74 ff.

¹⁹¹ The document (from the Archives départementales du Nord, B. 1871) is given in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. x, pp. 34–35, and for the date of the Gattilusio embassy, note Kervyn de Lettenhove, in his edition of Froissart, XVI, 274.

just come to Europe himself to make a personal appeal to the western powers—Venice and Genoa, France and England—for men, money, ships, and arms with which to defend his capital. While the envoys of the Gattilusio were seeking repayment of their loans to Nevers

and his companions (in October, 1400), Manuel was in Paris, planning to go on to London. Quite as extraordinary as any European's travels in the Levant were this Levantine's travels in Europe, to which we come in the following chapter.

15. MANUEL II, MARSHAL BOUCICAUT, AND THE CLASH BETWEEN VENICE AND GENOA

IN ROME the Curia understood the extent of the Turkish danger, and on 1 April, 1398, on 6 March, 1399, and on 12 January, 1400, Boniface IX charged crusading preachers to incite the faithful to further effort on behalf of the Emperor Manuel II who, although he was not in union with the Latin Church, still invoked the *salutiferum Christi nomen*.¹ But an extraordinary bull dated 27 May, 1400, enjoining all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of Christendom to preach the crusade within their respective jurisdictions, was suddenly quashed by order of the papal chamberlain. Whether Boniface wished to await the effect of his earlier bulls—or whether he believed that Manuel was going also to appeal to his Avignonese rival Benedict XIII—is impossible to say.² Papal influence in Europe, however, had been much reduced by the Great Schism. Boniface's support of the Byzantine cause was of little more assistance to Manuel than that of Benedict XIII, to whom Manuel later (in July, 1401) sent the engaging diplomat Alexius Vranas, who was then making a round of the Spanish kingdoms in the vain search for help against the Turkish sultan.³

¹ Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1398, no. 40, and ad ann. 1399, nos. 1–4, vol. VIII (vol. XXVII of Baronius-Raynaldus, Lucca, 1752), pp. 41, 43–44; cf. also the papal letter of 4 May, 1399, to Peter Radolinski, the bishop of Cracow (*ibid.*, nos. 6–7, pp. 45–46); N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle*, II (Paris, 1899), 80. The bull of 1 April, 1398, is published by A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Urbani PP. VI (1378–1389), Bonifacii PP. IX (1389–1404)*, . . . [for the full title see, above, Chapter 14, note 73], Rome, 1970, no. 55, pp. 112–13, and note the *indulgentia Terrae Sanctae* promulgated on Manuel II's behalf on 21 March, 1400 (*ibid.*, no. 85, pp. 171–73).

² Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, II, 81, gives a summary of Boniface IX's encyclical of 27 May, 1400. There is a rather speculative but interesting account of these crusading bulls in O. Halecki, "Rome et Byzance . . .," *Collectanea theologica*, XVIII (Lwów, 1937), 506–19. The full text of that of 27 May is now available in Tăutu, *Acta . . . Bonifacii PP. IX* . . . , no. 90, pp. 183–86, with the annotation: "Cancellata de mandato domini Camerarii, cum bullae fuerint laceratae per eundem dominum Camerarium."

³ Martin de Alpartil, *Chronica actuatorum temporibus domini Benedicti XIII*, ed. Franz Ehrle, Paderborn, 1906, I, 118–19 (in the *Quellen und Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft*, vol. XII): "Alexius de Vrana . . . , consiliarius Emanuelis imperatoris Grecorum, de mense iulii . . . veniebat ad petendum adiutorium et sucursum a papa contra Faysinum

Greek envoys had carried various appeals to the western powers, but only the French responded, and it took them months to do so. Charles VI finally turned, however, to Marshal Boucicaut, who stood out in the realm of action as Philippe de Mézières did in that of anti-Turkish propaganda. Boucicaut was appointed head of an expeditionary force of 400 men-at-arms, 400 varlets, and a body of archers, which set sail from Aigues-Mortes in late June, 1399, in four French ships and two galleys.⁴ They made their way to Genoa, where a naval armament was to join them.

As usual, Genoa had been in the throes of civil discord. Even a wave of religious enthusiasm was too much for the confused and rapidly changing government to handle. The streets were full of processions. Work in the shipyards was suspended. The Genoese galleys—eight had been decided upon—were far from ready when Boucicaut's squadron arrived in the city. On 22 July he complained to the French governor of Genoa, Colart de Calleville, and the then ruling commission of Fifteen. They gave as their excuse the recent processions and the riots which had broken out

Turchum, qui civitatem Constantinopolitanam tenebat obsessam cum XL galeis. . . ."Is this the mission to which Boucicaut's biographer refers when he states that Manuel "si fut devers le saint père, qui donna grand pardon à quiconque luy feroit bien"? (*Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chap. xxxv, p. 608b, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chap. xxxvi, p. 254a). Martin de Alpartil (d. 1440?) was a Spanish cleric who is found in the service of Benedict XIII at Avignon by the year 1398 (Ehrle, *op. cit.*, pp. xxvi, xxxi).

⁴ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. I, chap. xxix, pp. 601–2, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. I, chap. xxx, p. 247; and cf. Jean Juvénal des Ursins, *Hist. de Chas. VI*, *ibid.*, pp. 416–17. According to the Religious of S. Denis, *Chron. de Chas. VI*, II, 690, Boucicaut set out with 1,200 *stipendiarii* in May, and was received at Constantinople "tanquam angelus Domini." On 28 May, 1399, King Martin I of Aragon-Catalonia had sent both Boucicaut and Manuel II letters of recommendation of his squire Dalmau Darnius, who had enlisted in the expedition, on which see Antoni Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947 [1948], doc. DCLI, p. 679, and Const. Marinesco, "Du Nouveau sur les Relations de Manuel II Paléologue (1391–1425) avec l'Espagne," in the *Atti dello VIII congresso internazionale di studi bizantini* [held in April, 1951], 2 vols., Rome, 1953, I, 421. (The proceedings of the congress were published in the *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, vols. VII–VIII.)

in early May, but they promised to arm and dispatch the eight galleys within two weeks. Boucicaut was given a banquet on 28 July (1399), after which he set out with the French squadron. Six weeks later, on 9 September, he was anchored off the island of Sapienza, outside the Venetian harbor of Modon, still waiting for the Genoese contingent to reach him. The date of their departure for the east remains uncertain.⁵

The chronicler Cabaret's friend Jean de Châteaumorand went with Boucicaut as his second in command. With the Genoese galleys, which had finally reached him, a reinforcement of another eight galleys from Venice,⁶ two from Rhodes, and a galiot from Mytilene, Boucicaut managed to open up the Ottoman blockade of Constantinople. According to his biographer, when his forces were mustered "en une belle plaine pour les veoir," their numbers had risen to 600 men-at-arms, 600 varlets, and 1,000 bowmen "sans l'ost et l'assemblée de l'empereur." He also had twenty-one galleys, three large *galées huissières* for the transport of horses, and a half-dozen galiots and brigantines. With these forces, week after week, he pillaged and burned "mout bons villaiges et de beaux manoirs" belonging to the Turks, who were put to the sword whenever they were captured. The expedition, aided by a Byzantine contingent, failed to take the walled city of Nicomedia (Izmit), but after many deeds of valor "nos bons François" stormed and destroyed the Turkish castle of Riva (Iriva) on the Black Sea just east of the entrance to the Bosphorus.

If we can believe the author of the *Livre des faits*, Boucicaut was a one-man crusade. He also scored a diplomatic triumph by reconciling Manuel II with his nephew John VII. Since it was clear that, when Boucicaut departed, the Turks would return to the siege of Constantinople, it was decided that Manuel would go

back with him to France to seek further and larger help from Charles VI.⁷ "Et si le roy de France ne luy aydoit, que il iroit à refuge à tous les autres roys chrestiens." They sailed on Venetian galleys from the Sea of Marmara on 10 December, 1399, leaving John VII to rule the now exiguous empire during Manuel's absence. Châteaumorand, however, stayed behind with 100 men-at-arms, 100 varlets, and "a quantity of bowmen" as a garrison to defend Constantinople, where he had to contend with famine as well as the Turks. For a while, at least, he had the support of eight galleys, "quatre de Gennes et quatre de Venise." And Boucicaut's biographer, who is the chief source for the French mission to the Bosphorus, says that Châteaumorand maintained the city against the Turks for three years.⁸

Manuel II and Boucicaut put into the Venetian port of Modon in February, 1400, leaving the empress and Manuel's sons John [VIII]

⁷ On Manuel II's famous journey to the west, which excited the curiosity of fifteenth-century chroniclers no less than that of modern historians, see among the latter: Berger de Xivrey, "Mémoire sur la vie et les ouvrages de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue," *Mémoires de l'Institut de France: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, XIX, pt. 2 (1853), 1–201; A. A. Vasiliev, "The Journey of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus in Western Europe (1399–1403)" (in Russian), *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosviescheniia*, n.s., XXXIX (S. Petersburg, 1912), 41–78, 260–304, a detailed study with an extensive bibliography; M. Jugie, "Le Voyage de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue en Occident (1399–1403)," *Échos d'Orient*, XV (Paris, 1912), 322–32; Gustave Schlumberger, "Un Empereur de Byzance à Paris et à Londres," in *Byzance et croisades: Pages médiévales*, Paris, 1927, pp. 87–147; Sebastian Cirac Estopañan, *Bizancio y España: La Unión, Manuel II Paleólogo y sus recuerdos en España*, Barcelona, 1952, pp. 52–66; John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*, New Brunswick, 1969, pp. 167–99, 219–38; and, most recently, Donald M. Nicol, "A Byzantine Emperor in England: Manuel II's Visit to London in 1400–1401," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, XII-2 (1971), 204–25.

⁸ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chaps. xxx–xxxiv, pp. 602–7, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chaps. xxxi–xxxv, pp. 248–53. The date of Manuel's departure from Constantinople, ἀναβὰς εἰς τὰ κάτεργα τῶν Βενετῶν, is provided by a group of Byzantine "short chronicles," for which see Sp. P. Lampros, ed., *Παλαιολογία καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, 4 vols., Athens, 1912–30, III, 360–61; Lampros and K. Amantos, eds., *Short Chronicles* [in Greek], in *Μνημεῖα τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας*, publ. by the Academy of Athens, I-1 (1932–33), no. 18, p. 35, lines 14–16; Berger de Xivrey, *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, XIX-2 (1853), 94, followed by Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886, I, 379; A. A. Vasiliev, in the *Zhurn. Min. Nar. Prosvies.*, XXXIX, 55–56; Schlumberger, *Byzance et croisades*, pp. 96–97; Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 167–68.

⁵ Eugène Jarry, *Les Origines de la domination française à Gênes (1392–1402)*, Paris, 1896, pp. 321, 334–36. In 1398–1399 the Venetian Senate believed that Negroponte, Athens (then in the Republic's control), and the Morea were likely to be attacked by the Turks (F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I [Paris and The Hague, 1958], nos. 952, 956, and 962, pp. 221–23).

⁶ Cf. Misti, Reg. 44, fol. 105^v, dated 12 June, 1399, by which the Senate had raised the proposed Venetian contribution to the fleet "ad complementum galearum octo quas habere et tenere debemus secundum promissionem nostram," on which note M. Silberschmidt, *Das orientalische Problem zur Zeit der Entstehung des türkischen Reiches nach venezianischen Quellen*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1923, p. 195.

and Theodore in the charge of his brother, the Despot Theodore I of Mistra.⁹ The removal of his family from the Bosphorus suggests that Manuel did not completely trust his nephew and vicegerent John VII.¹⁰ The annalist Giunio Resti tells us that Manuel spent two weeks in Ragusa, and then departed for Rome.¹¹ It is certain, however, that he and Boucicaut gave Ragusa a wide berth, for plague was then rampant in the city.¹² They reached Venice in early May.¹³ While Boucicaut hurried on to Paris, Manuel was lodged for a brief spell in the palace which the Signoria had given to Niccolò II of Ferrara, now the (entirely rebuilt) Fondaco dei Turchi on the Grand Canal. From Venice Manuel traveled with dignified haste, from one sumptuous reception to another, through Padua, Vicenza, and Pavia to Paris, where he arrived on 3 June. The chronicler of S. Denis has described the profound impression which he made on the French court,¹⁴ where he remained for more than four months. Charles VI is said to have promised him 1,200 "combatans," to be maintained for a year by the French crown, for which he gravely thanked his Majesty "et partit de Paris, car jà y avoit bonne pièce demeuré."¹⁵

⁹ Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chap. 15 (Bonn, p. 56), and cf. the Pseudo-Sphrantzes ("Phrantzes"), *Annales*, I, 15 (Bonn, p. 62). On 27 February, 1400, the Venetian Senate agreed to offer both the imperial family and the despot of Mistra an asylum in Venice if Turkish aggression should drive them to such a desperate expedient (Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 96–97; Thiriet, *Régestes*, II [1959], no. 978, p. 10).

¹⁰ In March, 1400, the Venetian government took steps to try to persuade John VII to remain true to his imperial uncle and not yield to the deceitful promises of the Turks (Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 981, pp. 10–11), but as late as April, 1403, the Venetians thought it possible that John might seek to prevent Manuel's return to the throne in Constantinople (Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 136–37).

¹¹ Resti, *Chronica ragusina*, bk. VIII, ed. S. Nodilo, in *MSHS*, XXV: *Scriptores*, II, 188.

¹² Misti, Reg. 45, fol. 11^r.

¹³ On 4 April, 1400, the Venetian government had allocated 200 ducats for the Emperor Manuel's reception (Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 97).

¹⁴ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 754, 756, 758, and cf. Jean Juvénal, in Michaud and Poujoulat, *Nouvelle Collection des mémoires*, II (1850), 418–19; Berger de Xivrey, pp. 96–100; Vasiliev, pp. 60–74. The Doge Antonio Venier went out to meet the emperor in the state galley, "e acompagnalo infina a la chaxa de miser lo marchexe da Ferara, la qual è mesa a San Zane Degolado, la qual ly fo dada per soa abitacion" (*Chronique d'Antonio Morosini: Extraits relatifs à l'histoire de France*, eds. Germain Lefèvre-Pontalis and Léon Dorez, 4 vols., Paris, 1898–1902, I, 46). The church of S. Giovanni Decollato, partially restored in 1945, is behind the Fondaco dei Turchi.

¹⁵ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. 1, chap. xxxv, p. 608, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. 1, chap. xxxvi, p.

Reports of Manuel's western journey spread throughout Europe, and rumor had it that a Greek bishop and two religious in his suite had brought the head of S. George with them to Paris. On 28 July, 1400, King Martin I of Aragon-Catalonia, whose family had long been trying to obtain the relic of their patron saint, wrote about the matter to Don Ramón de Perellós, viscount of Roda, who seems to have been in Paris at the time. He often went there on business for the Avignonese pontiff Benedict XIII. King Martin had just seen a letter, which Don Ramón had written to a friend, with the interesting news "that with the emperor of Constantinople there has come [to Paris] a bishop of the church, who in common with two others has the head of S. George, and that if these three should find some lord who would assist them [*que ls faés alcun bé*], they would give it up to him." Don Ramón had informed his friend that, if his Majesty wished, he would negotiate with the bishop. In writing to Don Ramón on the twenty-eighth, King Martin acknowledged his well-known desire to get hold of the relic, but he was very doubtful of the Greeks' claim to have it. He had heard that Bertranet Mota de Salahia, lord of Livadia in Greece, who had possessed the head, had either given it to the Emperor Manuel or pledged it to the Venetians. Don Ramón was therefore cautioned to be sure the Greeks had the relic before he treated with them for the king's acquisition of it.¹⁶ Martin soon lost interest in the bishop and his two companions, however, for whosoever head they had, it was not that of S. George. The true relic was then the prize possession of Alioto de Caupena, Catalan lord of Aegina, who apparently had no intention of parting with it.¹⁷

Some three months after his arrival in Paris, Manuel II sent Alexius Vranas on a mission to

253a. In a letter to Manuel Chrysoloras, written in Paris apparently some weeks after his arrival, Manuel speaks of the hospitality of the royal family and his hopes for the future "unless the usual sorcery [*βασκανία*] of bad luck thwarts us, and some unexpected misfortune occurs" (Émile Legrand, ed., *Lettres de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue*, Paris, 1893, repr. Amsterdam, 1962, ep. 37, pp. 50–51, trans. into French by Berger de Xivrey, pp. 102–3; into Russian by Vasiliev, p. 70; and into English by Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 174–75).

¹⁶ A. Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, doc. DCLVI, pp. 683–84; K. M. Setton, "Saint George's Head," *Speculum*, XLVIII (1973), 1–12, esp. p. 8; and cf. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, p. 176, who misunderstood the document.

¹⁷ Setton, in *Speculum*, XLVIII, 7–8.

Martin I. From Barcelona, Vranas proposed to visit the courts of Castile and Navarre in his quest for military aid against the Turks. To prepare the way for him Martin wrote the archbishop of Saragossa on 15 October (1400) "en recomendacion singular" of his efforts on behalf of the emperor, "whose land and empire 'l'Amorat Bequin' [Bayazid] is striving to conquer with a great company of Turks and other peoples hostile to the holy Catholic faith, for the oppression and extermination of Christendom."¹⁸ On the following day Martin I wrote the vicegerent John [VII] in Constantinople that Vranas had come to Barcelona as Manuel's envoy "to seek from us and other Christian kings assistance for the defense of his empire and of the entire Christian faith [Latin Catholic as well as Orthodox] and for the destruction and complete desolation of that most wretched and vicious infidel who has oppressed and does not cease daily to oppress the empire and all Christians in the East." Martin had promised Manuel assistance, and hoped that other Christian kings would do so also, whereby he would not merely recover his empire, but would crush the enemy of the faith and cut to pieces his stubborn troops (*cornua cervicosa*). He urged John to stand firm, for he would soon see the emperor return with such a force of Christian warriors that, with God's grace, the Greeks would win a resounding victory over the Turks.¹⁹

Martin also addressed a letter to Manuel on 16 October, thanking him for the gift of two precious relics, a piece of Christ's tunic and a fragment of the sponge of the passion, which Vranas had doubtless brought with him to Barcelona. As for the aid which Manuel sought, Martin said that he granted it more than willingly, and he would inform Vranas of the *quantitas et numerus* upon the latter's return from the court of Castile.²⁰ The Byzantine envoy had set out on his mission well supplied with relics. At the Louvre on 30 August, 1400, Manuel had attested in a chrysobull, drawn up in Latin as well as in Greek, to the genuineness of a fragment of the true cross and of another piece of Christ's tunic, now described as "blue in color." When he got to Navarre, Vranas

presented the sacred memorials of Christ's earthly existence to Charles III of Navarre. The ceremony took place in the cathedral church of S. Maria in Pamplona on 6 January, 1401. The king's confessor Garsias de Henguy, bishop of Bayonne, received the relics. He was clad in full pontificals, as befitted the occasion, and led a procession of all the clergy in the city around the cloister of S. Maria, after which the gifts which Vranas had brought the king and people of Navarre were laid away, *cum ea qua decuit reverencia*, in the safe-keeping of the cathedral vaults.²¹

With the approach of autumn (in 1400) the Emperor Manuel got ready to visit Henry IV in England. He went first to Calais, where he remained for some time, and then crossed the channel, landing in England on 11 December (1400). Henry met him at Blackheath, south-east of London, as the fifteenth-century divine John Capgrave says: "In this same yere cam the Emperoure of Constantinople into Ingland for to have sum socoure ageyn the Turkis. The Kyng Herri met him on the Black Heth, on Seint Thomas Day the Apostil [21 December], and led him to London; and there had he good hostel at the Kyngis cost; and aftir went he ageyn with large giftis."²²

The Welsh chronicler Adam of Usk appears to have witnessed the reception:

The emperor of the Greeks visited the king of England in London, and was honorably received by him on the feast of S. Thomas the Apostle. He was seeking a subsidy against the Saracens. He stayed with the king, to the latter's great cost, for two whole months, and upon his departure was further assisted by large gifts. The emperor used to go about with members of his suite, all dressed uniformly in long, white robes cut in the shape of tabards. He scorned both the varieties and the disparities of English dress, asserting that they gave evidence of restlessness of spirit and instability. No razor touched the heads and beards of his chaplains. These Greeks were most devout in the divine services, soldiers as well as clergy chanting unconcernedly in their own tongue. I thought within myself how grievous it was

¹⁸ The documents are given in Marinesco, in *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VII, 422–25, and see Franz Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, pt. 5 (Munich and Berlin, 1965), nos. 3281–82, p. 87.

²² F. C. Hingeston, ed., *The Chronicle of England by John Capgrave*, London, 1858, repr. Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1972, p. 277 (Rolls Series), and for Manuel's stay in England, see especially D. M. Nicol, "A Byzantine Emperor in England," *Univ. of Birmingham Hist. Journal*, XII (1971), 204–25, cited above in note 7.

¹⁸ Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, doc. DCLVIII, p. 685.

¹⁹ Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, doc. DCLIX, pp. 685–86.

²⁰ Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, doc. DCLX, pp. 686–87. On 14 October (1400) Martin had urged upon Henry III of Castile a favorable response to the Byzantine appeal for aid (Marinesco, in *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VII, 422).

that this great Christian prince from the farther east was being forced by the infidels to visit the more distant islands of the west to get help against them! . . . The king observed Christmas with the emperor at Eltham.²³

Profoundly impressed by Henry IV's personality and by the splendor of his court, Manuel wrote an almost ecstatic letter to his friend Manuel Chrysoloras: "[The king] is granting us an offensive alliance of men-at-arms, archers, money, and ships to convey the army to the place we need it."²⁴ Henry's hold, however, upon the English throne, which he had usurped from Richard II (in 1399), was not yet secure enough to divest himself of either men or money. Nevertheless, he did order payment to Manuel of 3,000 gold marks which had been collected from the clergy and people of England during Richard's reign "pro defensione partium Romaeorum." Manuel received the money on 3 February, 1401, "cum immensis actionibus gratiarum," on which date it was turned over to him by Peter Holt, prior of the Hospital in Ireland.²⁵

In the meantime Alexius Vranas's Catalan mission appeared to be succeeding. On the very day that Manuel acknowledged receipt of 3,000 marks from the royal treasury in London, Martin I assured Charles VI that he was prepared to give Manuel the help which his envoy had requested. At the same time Martin wrote the emperor again, repeating his thanks for the piece of Christ's tunic and for the bit of

spongia . . . felle et aceto imbuta, which he had received from Vranas the preceding October. Now, however, he promised Manuel six armed galleys, which he said he would have ready for service as soon as the "other Christian kings and princes" provided the aid which they had agreed to furnish for an expedition against the Turks.²⁶ Martin may have been sincere; this was the usual formula for avoiding participation in an expedition to the Levant. The Venetians often employed it. In the mid-summer of 1401 Vranas brought Martin letters from both Manuel and Charles VI with the news that a French fleet was being prepared in Aigues-Mortes in July to sail eastward from Genoa in August. Charles asked Martin to have his six galleys ready to join the French in the expedition being planned against the Turks. Martin replied to Manuel and Charles in letters of 26–27 August (1401) that he had made clear to Vranas that he must be kept informed of the French preparations in sufficient time to arm his own galleys. But he had only lately learned from Charles's letter and from Vranas's report that the French fleet was now ready to sail from Aigues-Mortes to Genoa or had indeed already done so. There was not time for him to arm his galleys, and besides he had been planning on an expedition during the summer. Some of his "galleys" were apparently going to be *fustes de rems*, which would face undue perils with the advent of winter.²⁷

Manuel had returned to Paris by late Feb-

²³ Edw. Maunde Thompson, ed. and trans., *Chronicon Adae de Ush (A.D. 1377–1421)*, 2nd ed., London, 1904, pp. 56–57, with a translation (which I do not use) on pp. 219–20. Cf. Vasiliev, p. 262.

²⁴ Legrand, *Lettres*, ep. 38, p. 52; Berger de Xivrey, pp. 107–9; Vasiliev, p. 263; Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 178–80.

²⁵ F. C. Hingeston, ed., *Royal and Historical Letters during the Reign of Henry the Fourth*, I (London, 1860, repr. Wiesbaden, 1966), 56–57. Manuel had written to Peter Holt from Paris on 21 June, 1400, informing him of his intention to come to England. Peter responded on 11 July, advising him to delay his journey, because Henry IV was then campaigning against the malicious Scots (*ibid.*, pp. 39–40). Manuel apparently received only the 3,000 marks, for which he sent his acknowledgment to Peter Holt on 3 February, 1401. Other sums were pledged and eventually collected in England, but the Exchequer got hold of them for reimbursement of the money which Henry had made available to Manuel (Nicol, "A Byzantine Emperor in England," pp. 216–19). On 1 June, 1402, John VII Palaeologus, Manuel's vicegerent on the Bosphorus, addressed an appeal to Henry IV from Constantinople (Hingeston, I, 101–3): this was two months before the battle of Ankara, and the Greek capital seemed likely to fall under the "yoke of the infidel Saracens." Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, nos. 3276, 3280, and 3283, pp. 86, 87.

²⁶ Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, docs. DCLXIII–DCLXIV, pp. 688–89, dated 3 February, 1401.

²⁷ Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, docs. DCLXV–DCLXVI, pp. 690–91. The galley, galiot, brigantine, and fusta (in descending order of size) were all of the same general type. As he prepared to leave Martin's court (on 28 August, 1401), a safe-conduct was issued in the king's name to "Alexius Verna ambasiator . . . Emmanuelis Dei gratia imperatoris Romeorum . . . , qui ad nos et alios reges et principes Yspanie missus fuerat ab eodem pro petendo auxilium in subsidium Constantinopolis et aliarum parcium dicti imperii, quas perfidus Ammoratus Baquiri cum innumera caterva Turcorum . . . sibi conatur occupare" (*ibid.*, doc. DCLXVII, p. 692).

Despite his failure to provide the six galleys, Martin I tried to assist the Byzantines by allowing the collection in his domains of "diverse sums of money . . . to help the city of Constantinople" (*Dipl.*, doc. DCLXXXI, p. 702, and see also docs. DCLXXXII ff., dated 1404–1406). Benedict XIII ordered the preaching of the crusade "in omnibus regnis et terris eidem domino pape obedientibus in subsidium et adiutorium predicti imperatoris [Emmanuelis] et christiani nominis in Grecia . . . cum plena indulgentia . . ." (*ibid.*, doc. DCLXXXIV, pp. 706–7). Cf. Marinesco, in *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VII, 430–36, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, nos. 3285, 3287, p. 88.

ruary, 1401,²⁸ and remained there for almost two years (until late November, 1402). He was living on promises—in France as well as in England—which would never be fulfilled. In the meantime he sent his cousin Demetrius Palaeologus to the Signoria of Florence, seeking aid against the “detestanda barbaries” of the Turks, who were laying siege to Constantinople. The Florentines listened sympathetically to the imperial envoy, but they could give the Byzantines no help, they informed him, for they had scarcely resources enough to defend themselves against Gian Galeazzo Visconti, the aggressive duke of Milan, with whom they were then at war. “An Italian Bayazid threatens us,” they wrote Manuel on 20 August, 1401, “the friend of that persecutor of yours . . . , who plots and strives to reduce us and all Italy to his tyranny both by the whirlwind of war and by the foulest arts of peace.”²⁹

Month after month Manuel lived in the old castle of the Louvre. Undoubtedly he took excursions along the Seine and elsewhere, observing that life of prince and peasant which the three Limbourg brothers have depicted in the magnificent book of hours (the *Très Riches Heures*) which they did for the king's uncle John, the duke of Berry. Manuel must have seen a good deal of John, who lived in the Hôtel de Nesle on the left bank of the Seine, opposite the Louvre. John was among the princes of the royal house who had met Manuel at Charenton outside Paris upon the latter's first arrival (on 3 June, 1400), and three weeks later (on the twenty-fourth) Manuel attended the wedding of John's daughter Marie, countess of Eu, widow of Philippe d' Artois, constable of France. Captured at Nicopolis, as we have seen, Philippe had died at Mihalić in Asia Minor (*qui in Hungaria obierat*, says the chronicler of S. Denis). Marie now married John, count of Clermont, the son of Louis II of Bourbon, the leader of the Barbary Crusade. Cabaret states that Louis went out of his way to be gracious to the emperor and his Greek entourage.³⁰ As they discussed the prospects of

another crusade, they must often have talked of Barbary and Nicopolis. As Manuel took note of the French scene, the Limbourg brothers took note of him, and they have left us his portrait in the *Très Riches Heures*, where he appears as Augustus (fol. 22^r) and as Melchior in the Meeting of the Magi (fol. 51^v). Both these scenes show Manuel wearing the Byzantine conical hat in which his son John VIII is later depicted in Pisanello's medal.³¹

If Manuel found life in Paris pleasant, it was also frustrating. He neglected no opportunity, however, to win the good will of the western princes. When doughty old Pedro de Luna, the Avignonese Pope Benedict XIII, heard about the relics which Manuel was giving away, he apparently wanted one. On 20 June, 1402, Manuel sent him a *parva particula tunice . . . redemptoris nostri*, another little piece of Christ's blue garb. He also sent with it another chrysobull in Greek and Latin, certifying to its having been part of the rich store of relics which his imperial predecessors had long “guarded and preserved . . . in our city of Constantine.”³²

Alternating between periods of hope and discouragement,³³ when time hung heavy on his hands, Manuel wrote his friends letters and essays which he worked and reworked into a kind of literary embroidery. Then, suddenly

Musée Condé at Chantilly, MS. 65, fol. 10^v, shows the castle of the Louvre as it was in the time of Charles VI (in 1413, to be precise). Demolition of the Louvre was begun by Francis I in 1527, and nothing now remains of the castle which Manuel knew. On Manuel's gifts to John of Berry of various precious items *faits à ouvrage de Grèce*, see Millard Meiss, *French Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry*, I (London, 1967), 41, 57–58, 59, 304, 306, who cites J. Guiffrey, *Inventaires de Jean duc de Berry (1401–1416)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1894–96, II, nos. 214, 791, pp. 35, 262.

³¹ Manuel is also the model for Melchior in the Adoration of the Magi, in the *Très Riches Heures*, fol. 52^r, this time without the hat, on which see Constantin Marinesco, “Deux Empereurs byzantins en Occident: Manuel II et Jean VIII Paléologue,” in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 1957 [publ. 1958], pp. 23–35. As Meiss, *French Painting*, I, 58, remarks, the Limbourgs, having seen Manuel, “showed thereafter a penchant for long flowing beards on all historical worthies” (especially David).

³² The two texts of the chrysobull are given by Marinesco, in *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VII, 427–30, and in Cirac Estopañan, *La Union* (1952), pp. 100–102, and “Ein Chrysobullos des Kaisers Manuel II. Palaiologos für den Gegenpapst Benedikt XIII. vom 20 Juni 1402,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XLIV (1951), 89–93. Cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3290, pp. 88–89, and G. T. Dennis, “Official Documents of Manuel II Palaeologus,” *Byzantion*, XLI (1971), nos. 11–12, p. 49.

³³ Cf. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 184–99.

²⁸ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 774; Berger de Xivrey, p. 110; Vasiliev, pp. 267, 273–74.

²⁹ Giuseppe Müller, ed., *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll' Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi*, Florence, 1879, pt. I, doc. C, p. 148, and cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3286, p. 88.

³⁰ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, II, 758, 760; Jean Cabaret d'Orville, *La Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon*, ed. A. M. Chazaud, Paris, 1876, chap. LXXXVI, pp. 269–70. The calendar for October in the *Très Riches Heures*, in the

out of the blue on the feast of All Saints (1 November, 1402),³⁴ came the astounding news of Sultan Bayazid's overwhelming defeat at the hands of Timur and his Turkic hordes in the battle of Ankara (on 28 July).³⁵ Hastily Manuel began to prepare for his return to Constantinople. The French court rejoiced in the incredible good fortune which had saved his capital from almost certain occupation by the Turks. According to the chronicler of S. Denis, Manuel left Paris "on the Tuesday after the octave of S. Martin" (21 November). Charles VI presented him with an immense sum in gold, and granted him an annuity of 14,000 *écus d'or* to be paid from the royal treasury "donec ad uberiores fortunam perveniret." The battle of Ankara had also freed Jean de Châteaumorand from his long vigil on the walls of Constantinople. He could now return home, but Charles immediately commissioned him to conduct Manuel back to Constantinople with an escort of 200 men-at-arms.³⁶

³⁴ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, III (1841), 46: "circa Omnium Sanctorum festum." According to the chronicler, Christians who had escaped from Turkish prisons (*ergastula*) brought the news to Paris. On 8 and 9 October (1402), however, the Venetian Senate had sent Manuel the happy news, which probably reached him in less than three weeks (Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 47^v, dated the ninth): "Quod scribatur domino Imperatori Constantinopolitano in hac forma, viz., Magestati vestre significavimus pridie animo iocundanti felicem casum, et imperio vestro ac toti Christianitati non tantum utilem sed penitus oportunitum, conflictus videlicet et generalis destructionis illius . . . perfidissimi Baysiti Turchorum imperatoris ac gentis sue. . . . Nunc presentibus denotamus dictum novum et ipsius confirmationem. . . ." Cf. Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 122; Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1074, p. 31.

³⁵ On the prelude to Ankara, the battle, and its aftermath, see Marie-Mathilde Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La Campagne de Timur en Anatolie (1402)*, Bucharest, 1942, pp. 51–111, with extensive use of the oriental sources, and Gustav Roloff, "Die Schlacht bei Angora (1402)," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CLXI (1940), 244–62, who has attempted a succinct description of the movements (and an analysis of the tactics) of both Timur and Bayazid before the battle: Roloff concludes that, despite the fantastic figures given by the chroniclers, the Ottoman army had a maximum of 20,000 effectives, of whom 5,000 may have been janissaries. Timur had larger forces, but his fighting strength lay chiefly in the Mongols, who formed only a small minority among the diverse ethnic groups which made up his army. In short, "Timurs und Bayasids Streitkräfte sind ursprünglich ungefähr gleich stark—gegen 20,000 Mann—gewesen" (*ibid.*, pp. 254–56).

³⁶ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, III, 50, and for Châteaumorand's return from Constantinople in "September, 1402," see Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XXI, pp. 76–77. Jean Juvénal, *Hist. de Chas. VI*, eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, 421b, says that Manuel spent "deux ans et demy à Paris," which would be the case if we could discount his two months in

The Ottoman empire seemed shattered. Bayazid had built well, however, and despite a decade of civil war among his sons, the empire would recover from the debacle within a generation or so. Suleiman, who had commanded the left wing of his father's army at Ankara, escaped to Gallipoli and Adrianople (Edirne), where he maintained his court for some years. Timur reduced the area of Ottoman rule by re-establishing the emirates of Sarukhan, Aydin, Mentesh, Hamid, Tekke, Germiyan, and Karaman, which Bayazid had conquered in the early 1390's. The devastation of the Timurids was frightful, however, "for going from one city to another," says the historian Ducas, "they left such a wilderness where a city had been that one did not hear the barking of a single dog, the crow of a cock, or the cry of a child."³⁷ Ottoman subjects emigrated into "Rumelia," and strengthened the Turkish elements in Suleiman's European domain.

In northeastern Anatolia, Bayazid's youngest son Mehmed made a strong place for himself at Amasya, where large numbers of *ghazis* joined him. Isa was soon eliminated from the contest, but another brother, Musa, took up the reins of authority at Bursa (Brusa), the old center of Ottoman power.³⁸ As the contest continued, Musa eventually defeated Suleiman, and put him out of the way (in 1410–1411), only to be crushed in his turn by Mehmed at Jamurlu in Serbia (in 1413). Mehmed thus emerged as Bayazid's successor and as the sultan (until his death in 1421). In the meantime Suleiman, the most westernized of the four brothers, was trying to make peace with both the Greeks and the Latins. He needed time to build up his strength for the fratricidal struggle which he knew lay ahead. Also Timur's next moves were uncertain. Fear of the Timurids soon passed, however, for in the late spring or summer of 1403 the conqueror set out for his capital at Samarkand, and died at Otrar in February, 1405,

England. The chronicler of S. Albans is not very well informed (H. T. Riley, ed., *Thomae Walsingham, quondam monachi S. Albani, historia anglicana*, London, 1864, repr. 1965, II, 247).

³⁷ Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chap. 17 (Bonn, pp. 76–77).

³⁸ Bayazid's five sons all participated in the battle of Ankara, in the course of which one of them, Mustafa, disappeared. He was presumably killed on the field although an impostor, claiming to be Mustafa, appeared in later years (1416–1421), and we shall have occasion to take note of his activities in the next volume.

amidst preparations for an expedition against China.³⁹

Suleiman had hardly reached European soil when he sent an envoy to Venice (and to other states as well), urging the Senate to try to hasten the Emperor Manuel's return to Constantinople. Suleiman was prepared to look upon Manuel as a father, and had no doubt that they would live in true concord with each other. Manuel might make free with Ottoman territory (in Europe) as though it were his own. Since the Venetians had always been at one with the emperor, Suleiman wished to be the Republic's son also, and of course the Venetians might come and go in his territory "as though it were their own." He intended to keep European Turkey open to their trade. On 7 December, 1402, the Senate informed Suleiman's envoy that they had been doing their best to persuade Manuel to quicken the pace of his return to the Bosphorus. Suleiman's envoy had apparently hinted darkly at certain machinations of the Byzantine vicegerent John VII and his Genoese allies, which his master and Manuel might agree to thwart. Be that as it might, the envoy was assured that, when Manuel reached Italy (and Venice), the Senate would seek to speed him on his way and to a satisfactory solution of his problems.⁴⁰

³⁹ Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La Campagne de Timur*, pp. 95–96.

⁴⁰ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 57^r, dated 7 December, 1402: "Capta: Quod respondeatur isti oratori magnifici domini Zalabi, filii Baysiti, qui reductus est in partibus Grecie, ad illa verba que nobis dixit parte sua, ortando nos ad suadendum domino imperatori Chiermanoli quod ipse debeat presto se reducere ad partes Constantinopolis, nam dispositio sua est esse eius filium et non recedere a voluntatibus suis, non dubitans quod ipsi bene erunt in concordio, quia voluit quod possit disponere et ordinare de terris et locis suis sicut de propriis et concludit quod, quia nos fuimus semper unum cum domino imperatore predicto, ipse etiam intendit esse filium nostrum et quod possimus in terris et locis suis ire et reverti ut in propriis. . . ." Suleiman promised the Venetians landing stages (*scalae*) and freedom of trade in his domains. . . . "Ad alteram partem de suadendo domino imperatori Chiermanoli adventum suum ad has partes et redditum ad civitatem Constantinopolitanam ut possint esse in concordio simul et obviare his que ordinantur per nepotem et Januenses, nos dicimus quod veritas est quod nos diebus preteritis suasimus satis dicto domino imperatori per litteras nostras quod celeriter ipse vellet venire ad has partes et reducere se ad suum imperium, sperantes quod propter suam immensam sapientiam omnia negotia deinde ponerentur in bono termino et in bono ordine. . . ." Snatches of the text are given by Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 125–26. Cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1083, p. 33, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3292, p. 89, both of whom erroneously date Manuel's departure from Paris on 14 November

It may be that John VII and the Genoese were seeking to play off Musa against his brother Suleiman or that they were trying to deal with Timur to the further detriment of the Turks. In one way or another John was presumably working in his own rather than in Manuel's interests. In January or early February, 1403, Suleiman managed to negotiate at Gallipoli a treaty of peace with "lo gran imperador Caloiani, imperador di Griesi, mio pare," as well as with the Hospitallers of Rhodes, Venice, Genoa and the Genoese colony on Chios, and the duchy of Naxos. By the treaty Suleiman gave up Thessalonica and the Chalcidic peninsula, together with a wide area around Constantinople, to John VII, who was no longer to pay the Turkish tribute. John might also build any fortresses he wished in the ceded areas. Suleiman even promised to defend Constantinople: "If there is any attack by Timur [*alguna novidade de Tamberlan*], I will furnish as many galleys as I have and the mariners to proceed to Constantinople at my expense if there is need." He surrendered to John the islands of Skopelos, Skiathos, and Skyros. Both Latin and Greek merchants might trade, and pay only the customary tolls and duties, in Suleiman's domain and in whatever other territory he might acquire "si Dio me dara etiamdio altro paise per mar et per terra." All his ports would be open to Christian merchants, who might export as much grain as they wished, and his customs officers would not harass them. The duty on each "bushel" (*mozo*) of the weight of Constantinople would be fixed at one *hyperpyron*.

Suleiman's ships would not enter or leave the Dardanelles without the express "word of the emperor and all the [Christian] league." He agreed to release the Greek prisoners held by the Turks in his domain, exchange prisoners with the Genoese and Venetians, and exempt the Genoese of Chios, New Phocaea, and the Black Sea from the payment of tribute. Since the Acropolis had just been wrested from the Venetians by Antonio Acciajuoli, son of the late lord Nerio, Suleiman promised to restore it to them. He also ceded to the Venetians the mainland coast opposite the island of Negroponte, to a depth of five miles, but he retained whatever salt flats and wharfage there might be in the area. He relinquished the

(1402). Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, p. 223, gives the correct date.

fortress of Salona to the Hospitallers. In the event of either bloodshed or disagreement, Suleiman avowed "che la paxe non se rompa ma remagna ferma," and that any differences which might arise should be settled amicably by mediation.⁴¹ Nevertheless, according to Pietro Zeno, the lord of Andros, who spent eight days at Gallipoli, negotiating the final draft of the treaty with bribery as well as with finesse, the Turks were unhappy about the concessions they were making to the Byzantines. The Turks were yielding to the duress of circumstance, for the reversal of their fortunes had required a reversal of their policy of aggression against Byzantium. Contrary to the expectations of the time, however, the treaty was to hold for the remaining years of Suleiman's tenure of power. Anxious for a free hand to deal with his brother Musa, Suleiman renewed the treaty—or one very like it—with Manuel shortly after the latter's arrival back home.⁴²

On the return journey Manuel's first important stop was at Genoa, where he arrived on 22 January, 1403. His friend Boucicaut, now governor of the city, gave him an imperial wel-

come. Three Ligurian galleys were assigned to service "nelle provincie di Levante," where the future of the Genoese colony at Pera was inextricably linked with that of Constantinople.⁴³ Before his arrival in Genoa, however, Manuel had sent envoys to Venice, to inform the Senate of his itinerary and to request transport back to his own country. In answer to the envoys' inquiry as to how many galleys the Signoria would make available *pro suo transitu*, the Senate stated on 31 January that they must await more precise news than they yet had received concerning conditions in Greece. It would be soon enough to decide when the emperor reached Venice, and the envoys could rest assured that the Senate would act in accord with both the emperor's honor and that of the Republic. While in Genoa, Manuel offered to try to relieve the growing tension between his hosts and the Venetians. The latter were gravely disturbed by the seizure of their ships and the disruption of their trade as a result of Genoese operations against young King Janus I of Cyprus (1398–1432), who wanted to retake Famagusta from the Ligurian merchants and break their hold upon the island.⁴⁴

⁴¹ The text exists only in a poor Venetian translation, for which see Louis de Mas Latrie, "Commerce et expéditions militaires de la France et de Venise," *Mélanges historiques*, III (1880), no. xxii, pp. 178–82 (in the Docs. inédits sur l'hist. de France); G. M. Thomas, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II (1899, repr. 1965), no. 159, pp. 290–93; and especially G. T. Dennis, "The Byzantine-Turkish Treaty of 1403," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXXIII (1967), 72–88. The treaty is dated in January or February, 1403, because on 20 February of this year two scribes of the curia in Pera were paid for preparing the text and extracts of the "instrument of peace which has been entered into [*instrumentum pacis inite*] by the most serene lord emperor and our commune with the league on the one hand and, on the other, [by] the illustrious lord 'Mosorman Jhalabi' [Suleiman], lord of the Turks in Greece" (Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 58–59).

Venice was represented at the peace conference at Gallipoli by Pietro Zeno, lord of Andros, whose account of the negotiations has been published by Iorga, *ibid.*, I, 126–30, and by Dennis, *Orient. Christ. periodica*, XXXIII, 82–87. On 2 June the Senate reimbursed Zeno for the expense he had incurred in *tractatibus pacis concludere* (Dennis, *ibid.*, pp. 87–88, and see Karl Hopf, "Geschichte der Insel Andros und ihrer Beherrscher in dem Zeitraume von 1207–1566," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XVI [Vienna, 1855], 78). Cf. also W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, II (1886, repr. 1967), 267–69; Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La Campagne de Timur*, pp. 105–7, 133; Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 224–27; and (on Suleiman's promise to return Athens to the Venetians) K. M. Setton and H. W. Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, III (1975), 266–67.

⁴² Dennis, in *Orient. Christ. periodica*, XXXIII, 76–77, 82–83, 85–86.

⁴³ Giorgio Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII (1730), col. 1196; Uberto Foglietta, *Del-l'Istorie di Genova*, bk. ix, ad ann. 1403, trans. F. Serdonati, Genoa, 1597, p. 390 (reprinted in the *Historiae urbium et regionum Italiae rariores*, Bologna, n.d.). Cf. Berger de Xivrey, pp. 115–16.

⁴⁴ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, *Senatus Secreta*, Reg. 1, fol. 86v: "Quod respondeatur oratoribus domini Imperatoris Constantinopolitani ad ambaxitam nobis expositam parte sua, et primo ad primam partem per quam ipse significavit nobis deliberasse de eundo primo Ianuam et causas propter quas et de veniendo postea Venecias ut dehinc faciat transitum suum ad partes suas. . . . Ad secundam partem in qua fecerunt mentionem quod dictus dominus Imperator vellet sentire a nobis quot galeas sibi dare vellemus pro suo transitu antedicto et quo tempore paratas, respondeatur quod quia ad presens nos nullam vel modicam informationem habemus de factis Romanie. . . . male possemus sue Maiestati deliberatam responsionem dare, sed adveniente huc sua Serenitate, quo tempore cum Dei gratia speramus habere nova de partibus antedictis, nos audiemus illa que nobis dicere voluerint superinde et poterimus providere per illum modum qui nobis videbitur esse cum honore sue Serenitatis et nostro" and cf. Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 131; Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1092, p. 35; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3293, p. 89; Delaville Le Roulx, I, 416–17; George Hill, *History of Cyprus*, II (1948), 447–53, who does not mention Manuel.

On 5 July, 1402, the Senate had informed an envoy whom Boucicaut had sent to Venice that he and the commune of Genoa were misinformed in their understanding that Venice had sent military assistance to King Janus of Cyprus, who was then believed to have Famagusta

According to the chronicler Giorgio Stella, Manuel left Genoa on 10 February.⁴⁵ Before the twenty-sixth he was in Venice, where he apprised the Senate of his desire to spend about a month in the Morea to set the despotate in order, for although his brother Theodore I was ruler there, the Byzantine Morea was part of his empire. He wished too to foregather (at Mistra) with the envoys whom he had sent to the Vlachs, Albanians, Serbs, and other Christians who dwelt in the area. He had apparently sent an envoy also to "Muslmam Zalaperii" (Suleiman), son of the late Bayazid, and he wanted to await his reply in the Morea. When he had gathered the information he sought from these sources, he would know better whether to take the land route to Constantinople, which was shorter, or to go by sea, which might be safer. The Genoese had offered to send three galleys to Modon to take him thence to the Bosphorus. Manuel warned the Senate that Christian galleys should patrol the Dardanelles, "and quickly," lest Timur Beg cross over into Europe. The safety of Christendom required such action. Manuel had to know the Venetian response to all this, so that he might inform the Genoese government.

Shortly after Monday, 26 February, Manuel told the Senate that he had now decided to go to Constantinople by water. On 2 March, after a good deal of shilly-shallying, the Senate stated that they would immediately arm three galleys to take him to the Morea, and when they arrived there, if he was able to proceed to Constantinople, they would take him all the

way with as many members of his suite as possible. Manuel was not prepared to move with such dispatch, however, and made further "requisitiones et declarationes sue intentionis et voluntatis," which caused further disagreement in the Senate. Bayazid's victory at Nicopolis had forecast the extinction of the Byzantine presence in Constantinople, but his defeat at Ankara had clothed Manuel once more in the garb of authority on the Bosphorus. The Venetians did not want him to leave their city "ita male contentus," and yet they were unwilling to tie up armed galleys for a month in the Morea.⁴⁶

In the next few days some progress seemed to be made, however, for on 5 March the Senate voted to instruct Carlo Zeno, captain-general of the Gulf (the Adriatic), to go immediately with his five galleys to Modon, on

⁴⁵ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fols. 88^v–90^v, dated 26 February to 2 March, 1403: "Cum serenissimus dominus Emanuel Imperator . . . rogaverit . . . nostrum dominium quod faciamus ipsum conduci ad partes Amoree, in quo loco ipse videtur esse dispositus morari forte per mensem unum pro regulando dictas partes Amoree que licet sint fratribus sui [Theodori] etiam sunt de iurisdictione sui imperii et pro sciendo opiniones et responsiones Vlacorum, Albanensium, Servorum et aliorum dominorum Christianorum circumstancium dictis partibus ad quos misit suos ambaxiatores. . . . [Manuel also expected a Turkish envoy to come to him in the Morea.] Quia habita informatione et collatione cum predictis melius potuerit deliberari de transitu suo ad partes Constantinopolis, viz. aut per terram que esset brevior via aut per mare, significando nobis quod Januenses obtulerint sibi tres galeas venturas ad partes Mothoni pro suo transitu ad partes Constantinopolitanas, et etiam avisando nos quod omnino videretur ei necessarium pro conservatione dicti imperii quod in strictu esse debeant et presto galee ad obstandum ne Timerbei transeat strictum pro bono Christianitatis . . .," and for the rest, see the summary in Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 132–33, and cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3294, p. 89.

We should perhaps note that although Ducas, *Hist. byzantina*, chap. 14 (Bonn, p. 56), says that Manuel visited Florence and Ferrara (in the spring of 1400) on his way to France, Berger de Xivrey, pp. 116, 119, followed by Vasiliev, pp. 290–93, believes that Florence and Ferrara were included en route from Genoa to Venice, and that Manuel saw Boniface IX in Florence, for all of which there is no evidence. In fact a Venetian document of 22 March, 1403, shows that Boniface was then in Rome (Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 93^r). Whatever stops he made along the way, Manuel went directly from Genoa to Venice.

Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 227–28, is mistaken in believing that Manuel arrived in Venice in March. The entries in Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, II, 89, which he takes to refer to the Venetian Senate, relate to the futile actions of the Senate and Councils of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), on which see below, note 55. Barker's narrative is confused by the fact he dates Manuel's arrival in Venice almost a month too late.

under siege (Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxiv, pp. 96–97). In December the Senate dispatched Zaccaria Trevisan to Boucicaud and the Genoese Council of Anziani to protest against the Genoese seizure of several Venetian ships with their cargoes and to demand an indemnity (*ibid.*, II, no. xxv, pp. 99 ff.). The possibility existed of war with the Genoese, "quia sunt homines superbi et male ostinati" (p. 107). On 5 May, 1403, the Senate wrote Boucicaud's lieutenant and the Council of Anziani in Genoa confirming Trevisan's acceptance of their offer of compensation "in facto emende et satisfactionis dannorum per gentes et galeas vestre comunitatis in insulis Cipri et Rodi nostris civibus et subditis illatorum," for which payment was to be made on the following 1 September (Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 101^r, and note Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. ix, nos. 262–63, p. 292, and Delaville Le Roulx, I, 417–20). Boucicaud had already left Genoa with a fleet for the east (on which see below), knowing that a settlement was in sight and that the possibility of war had been averted.

⁴⁶ Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII, col. 1196E.

the southwest prong of the Morea, to convey the emperor with as many as forty persons from there as far eastward as Vasilipotamo (at the mouth of the Eurotas) or Lavatia (Vatika) or to some other place in the Byzantine despotate that he might choose. Manuel had requested *magnis precibus* that the galleys should stop at Modon for at least four days to take the Empress Helena on board, to which the Senate gave its assent. In any event Zeno was not to carry the imperial party beyond Monemvasia, and he was not to remain at Manuel's port of disembarkation for more than a single day. If Manuel should see fit to remain in Modon for some time or should have to return there, he must be informed that the castellans were always expressly forbidden to allow any "notable person" to stay there with a retinue of more than twelve persons. The Senate wanted Manuel to go on into his brother's territory. He was not to be allowed to stay in Coron. The Senate did finally agree, nevertheless, "that if the lord emperor should wish to remain in Modon, he may be received with twenty persons in addition to the empress and her retinue, which has been staying with her there in Modon up to now."⁴⁷

On the following day (6 March) the Senate apparently agreed that Manuel might be "received" in both Modon and Coron with as many as forty persons, but nothing is recorded as to whether he might stay in Coron.⁴⁸ At the same time the Senate made a modest provision of £300 for the emperor's reception at Pola, Corfu, Modon, and Coron, where he might break the tedium of the return voyage.⁴⁹ On the tenth and the eleventh the Senate passed resolutions to arm the three galleys which were to take Manuel to Modon. Leonardo Mocenigo was now elected captain of the flotilla, with three commanders or *sopracomiti* of galleys

under him.⁵⁰ The time of the emperor's departure was approaching when on the twenty-sixth the motion, which had been passed in the Collegio, was confirmed in the Senate "that in order to arm quickly those three galleys of which Ser Leonardo Mocenigo is the captain, twenty-five men may be taken on for each galley with a pay of 15 *lire* a month, and the paymasters of the Armamento are to be so instructed."⁵¹

The Senate also appointed Jacopo Suriano "ambassiator iturus in Romaniam et in partibus Turchorum" to secure confirmation and extension of the Graeco-Latin treaty which Pietro Zeno had helped to arrange, in January (1403), with the late Sultan Bayazid's son Suleiman. If possible, Suriano was also to seek out "Bayazid's other son, who is in Turkey"—Musa or Isa—before proceeding to Constantinople, where he would make his diplomatic obeisance to either Manuel II or John VII, depending on who controlled the Byzantine government at the time of his arrival. The Senate certainly preferred Manuel to the pro-Genoese John, but chiefly they wanted a stable Byzantium, which would and could honor the commercial and other concessions the Venetians had long enjoyed on the Bosphorus.

Suriano was to go with Mocenigo's galleys, which would take the emperor to Modon, where they would await the captain-general of the Gulf. Suriano would have more than enough time to consult with Manuel along the way, but apparently he was not to deal with Manuel officially until he had returned to Constantinople after seeing Bayazid's "other son" in Turkey. If he then found Manuel on the throne, he was to request the renewal of the long-standing quinquennial truce between Venice and Byzantium, of which Francesco Foscolo had secured the last confirmation a dozen years before (in June, 1390).⁵² Since Suriano's com-

⁴⁷ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fols. 90^v–91^r, published in C. N. Sathas, ed., *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, I (1880), no. 5 pp. 5–6.

⁴⁸ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 66^v; Sathas, *Docs. inédits*, II (1881), no. 319, p. 107. Although no vote is given, a cross was made in the left margin of the register, indicating that the motion was accepted. (Such crosses are never indicated in Sathas's volumes.)

⁴⁹ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 67^r: "Quod pro honorando serenissimum dominum Imperatorem Constantinopolis possint expendi de pecunia nostri communis per rectores nostros Corphoi, Mothoni, Coroni et Pole libre CCC . . .," of which the count of Pola might spend 50 *librae*; the bailie and captain of Corfu, 50; and the castellans of Modon and Coron, each 100.

⁵⁰ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 67^r: ". . . de armando tres galeas pro associando serenissimum dominum Imperatorem Constantinopolis," which is Sanudo's source in the *Vite de' duchi di Venezia*, in *RISS*, XXII (1733), cols. 789E–790A.

⁵¹ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 70^r: "Capta in Collegio: Quod pro armando presto istas tres galeas, quarum est capitaneus Ser Leonardus Mocenigo, possint accipi homines xxv pro galea cum soldo librarum quindecim in menses, et sic committatur solutoribus Armamenti." On the enrollment of crews for the communal galleys, see Frederic C. Lane, *Venice and History*, Baltimore, 1966, pp. 216 ff., with refs. to the paymasters from the *Ufficiali al Armamento*, and *passim*, for the different values of the *lira* (*libra*).

⁵² F. Miklosich and Jos. Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata*, III

mission appears to be dated 9 April, Mocenigo's galleys could not have sailed before the ninth or tenth of the month.⁵³

Manuel could not have left Venice later than 9 or 10 April since on or before 14 May the Senate received a letter from Carlo Zeno, captain-general of the Gulf, explaining that the commanders or *sopracomiti* of the galleys on which the emperor had left the lagoon were claiming payment for thirty-two days' expenses. The date of Zeno's letter is not given. It would seem to have been written before the expiration of the period which the galley commanders knew would amount to thirty-two days. Although the Senate was willing for Zeno to pay the commanders of the "galleys of Crete," on which Manuel, the empress, and eight attendants had traveled from Modon to Vasilipotamo, the three days' expenses they requested, the *sopracomiti* of the galleys which had taken the emperor from Venice had already received 100 ducats for expenses, and would have to await their return to Venice for an accounting and final settlement.⁵⁴

(1865, repr. 1968), no. xxxiii, pp. 135–43; Thomas, *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, II, no. 135, pp. 224–29; Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. VIII, no. 347, pp. 207–8, and cf. nos. 168 and 187. According to the truce of 1390 the Byzantine government owed Venice 17,163 *hyperpyra*, which remained unpaid in 1403 (cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3192, pp. 72–73).

⁵³ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 72^r, dated 5 April, 1403. Suriano's commission, which seems to be dated the ninth, is given on fols. 73^v–75^v. It lacks the cross in the left-hand margin of the register, but was clearly put into effect since on 2 May the Senate ordered Suriano to proceed on his journey, presumably from Modon, to treat with the Turks concerning the peace: If Manuel was using the galleys, Suriano was to go in two cogs that were available in the port (Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 79^v, with the marginal cross). Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 136–37, 138, gives summaries of the commission of 9 April and the senatorial resolution of 2 May.

Suriano was to go "ad alterum filium Baysiti qui est in Turchia antequam ires in Constantinopolim" (Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 74^r). By that time it should be clear who was going to be emperor. Suriano was, however, to deal with John VII "in casu . . . quo dictus dominus imperator Emanuel non intrasset in imperio et quod in tuo reditu a filio Baysiti de partibus Turchie imperator Chaloianni foret in imperio" (*ibid.*, fol. 75^r).

⁵⁴ Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 83^v, dated 14 May: "Cum nobilis vir Ser Karolus Geno [Carlo Zeno] capitaneus generalis Culfi scripserit nobis quod a Mothono usque Vasilipotomum sopracomiti galearum Crete super quibus erat dominus Imperator Emanuel et domina Imperatrix cum sua committiva in summa personis VIII fecerunt expensas eis pro tribus diebus nichil accipiendo ab eis, similiter etiam quod facta fuit expensa domino Imperatori predicto et sue comitive per sopracomitos galearum de Venetiis pro diebus xxxii . . . , vadit pars quod respondeatur et mandetur

The Ragusei had expected the imperial party to make a courtesy call at their city,⁵⁵ but the Venetian galleys sailed on to Corfu, where the bailie and captain of the island had been allotted 50 *lire* to receive the emperor when he landed. Thereafter the course lay through S. Maura, Cephalonia, and Zante to Modon and Vasilipotamo, as we have just seen, and disembarking at the mouth of the "royal river," Manuel went up the Eurotas valley to Mistra, the capital of the despotate.

Having deposited the emperor in Modon or somewhere in the despotate, Carlo Zeno was directed to join to the galleys already assigned

dicto capitaneo Culfi quod debeat dare sopracomitis Crete pro expensis predictis pro tribus diebus id quod sibi videbitur iustum—pro sopracomitis vero de Venetiis, licet habuerint ducatos centum pro facto predicto, provideatur in eorum reditu Venetias prout videbitur iustum." The resolution was passed *de parte* 51, *non* 22, *non sinceri* 17.

⁵⁵ In March, 1403, the Ragusan Senate (*Consilium Rogatorum, Vijeće Umoljenih*) sought and received authority from the Grand Council (*Consilium Maius, Veliko Vijeće*) to expend small sums of money "in honorando Imperatorem Constantinopolitanum" (see M. A. Andreeva, "Zur Reise Manuels II. Palaiologos nach Westeuropa," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXXIV [1934], 37–47, 351, and cf. Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, II, 89, and B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au moyen âge*, Paris and The Hague, 1961, pp. 44–45, and *régestes* nos. 511, 513–14, pp. 247–48).

Those who publish texts and *régestes* of documents bear a particular responsibility which, great scholar though he was, N. Iorga sometimes failed to meet. Even a trivial error can have unhappy consequences. Andreeva, *op. cit.*, has followed Iorga's erroneous summary in the *Notes et extraits*, I, 133, of the Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 67^r, to the effect that "le sénat vénitien donne des instructions pour les deux galères qui accompagneront l'empereur de Constantinople." As a result Andreeva, pp. 38, 45, has proposed an untenable hypothesis as to why Manuel did not stop at Ragusa. Believing that the Venetian Senate put two galleys at Manuel's sole disposal on 11 March, Andreeva sees a "change of plan," when on 24 March Suriano was elected to go on an embassy to the Turks [Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 69^r], and Manuel was to go with him, in the three galleys commanded by Leonardo Mocenigo. Manuel would have been "Befehlshaber" of the two galleys and could or would have put into Ragusa, Andreeva thinks, but he was "only a guest on board" the flotilla of three, and the Venetians did not wish to stop at Ragusa, which belonged [theoretically] to the hostile King Sigismund. This explanation falls to the ground with the correction of Iorga's unfortunate slip (see above, note 50). Although the Venetian Senate heard and voted on various resolutions relating to the emperor's passage, and changed their mind more than once, they had intended from the start that Manuel should leave Venice in Mocenigo's three galleys.

On Iorga's remarkable career as scholar and patriot, see D. M. Pippidi, ed., *Nicolas Iorga, l'homme et l'oeuvre, à l'occasion du centième anniversaire de sa naissance*, Bucharest, 1972.

to him the four "galleys of Crete" as well as the galleys *Trevisana* and *Truna*. He was then to head for Crete with all speed "to get the news" and to learn how Venetian shipping was faring at Genoese hands in the Levant. It might be necessary to send a galley to Rhodes for information. Thereafter he was to hasten back with the galleys to the eastern shores of the Ionian Sea between Corfu and Modon and to await further orders.⁵⁶ The Genoese were known to be preparing a fleet to go to Cyprus, where they were having trouble. They would bear watching, which was the chief reason for the Venetian Senate's unwillingness to tie up galleys by waiting for Manuel in the Morea or to provide him with a naval guard of honor to Constantinople.

As Manuel rode the short distance northward to his brother's court, his mind must have wandered back to the events of recent months as well as forward to reunion with his family. In recollection he doubtless contrasted the grand welcome he had received from the Genoese (they had given him 3,000 florins, and apparently promised him three galleys for defense against the Turks)⁵⁷ with the cool caution he had met in Venice, where the Senate's decision not to take him farther east than Monemvasia had left his transportation back to Constantinople in doubt. The response of the Genoese

to his needs was probably due less to the ties of their colony at Pera with Constantinople than to those of their governor with Manuel. The intrepid marshal was determined to employ the resources of Genoa, at home and abroad, against the infidels in the Levant, especially against the Turks. Boucicaut was the arch-crusader of his time. He believed that the disaster which had overtaken the Turks at Ankara made it possible for the Christians to avenge the defeat in which he had himself shared at Nicopolis. Besides their colony at Pera or Galata, across the Golden Horn from Manuel's capital, the Genoese possessed Caffa in the Crimea, trading stations on the Sea of Azov, the island of Chios, and the port of Famagusta on the east coast of Cyprus, the main depot in transit for goods coming from Egypt and Syria.⁵⁸

King Janus's abortive attempt to regain possession of Famagusta, which the Genoese had acquired in their extraordinary expedition of thirty years before (in 1373–1374), now gave the adventurous Marshal Boucicaut the pretext he needed to return to the Levant. A quick sketch of the background may be helpful. The Cypriote chroniclers Machaeras, Strambaldi, Amadi, and Florio Bustron deal at length with the events. So does the late Sir George Hill. Besides Famagusta the Genoese had also taken Paphos and Nicosia and seized young King Peter II as well; Kyrenia had held out against them under Peter's uncle James, the constable of "Jerusalem," for which he paid with a long, cruel imprisonment in Genoa. It was almost the end of the independent kingdom of Cyprus. What the double-dealing of the Lusignan leadership (which included Peter II's interfering mother Eleanor of Aragon) had not succeeded in losing, was gained by the treachery of the Genoese, who violated their solemn oaths (made on the gospels and at the altar) as though salvation were a commodity which they could later purchase at their leisure.

The Genoese expedition had been financed by a joint-stock company, formed for the purpose, which survived for decades and paid dividends to the investors and their heirs (in the "Old Mahona of Cyprus").⁵⁹ Peter II "the

⁵⁶ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 91^r, dated 9 March, 1403: ". . . Vadt pars quod scribatur et mandetur capitaneo nostro quod deposito et dimisso domino Imperatore Emanuele aut in Mothono aut in aliquo loco domini despoti secundum continentiam partis pridie capte super hac materia et dato ordine quod galea Trevisana, si nundinum applicuerit Mothonum, sequatur ipsum capitaneum, et si applicuerit ducendo eam secum, debeat in bona gratia, si quatuor galee Crete nundinum applicuerint Mothonum sicut est credendum, ire quam velocius poterit in Candidam cum galeis sibi commissis tam pro sciendo nova et specialiter quem modum observaverunt galee et navigia Januensium versus naves nostras quam etiam principaliter ad sollicitandum expeditionem et exitum dictarum galearum Crete. . . . [If there was a dearth of news in Crete, Zeno was to send a galley to Rhodes to see what could be learned of Genoese activities, after which he was to return with the galleys, including the *Trevisana*, to the area of Modon and Corfu. He could expect further instructions at Corfu.] Et ut armata nostra sit forcior propter casus qui possent occurrere mandetur capitaneo nostro quod inveniundo galeam Trunam debeat ipsam ducere secum. . . . [The *galea Truna*, so-called because Eustachio Truno was its *sopracomitus*, might need refitting, in which case Zeno should attend to the matter. If an emergency arose concerning which the Senate should know, a galley could be sent to Parenzo (Poreč), whence a ferry service was maintained with Venice.]"

⁵⁷ Stella, *Annales genuenses*, in *RİSS*, XVII, col. 1196D.

⁵⁸ On the Genoese possessions in the Levant when Boucicaut became governor of the city and its surroundings (in October, 1401), note the *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. IX, pp. 619–20, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, pp. 265–66.

⁵⁹ The Old Mahona was not "created in 1383 to re-

Fat" recovered Paphos and his capital of Nicosia, but at his death in October, 1382, the Genoese were firmly entrenched in Famagusta, which in fact they were to hold until January, 1464. Peter's uncle, the Constable James, succeeded him as king of Cyprus and titular king of Jerusalem (1383–1398). At the time of his royal inheritance, however, James was still a prisoner in Genoa. His eldest son Janus, with whom Boucicaut was now involved, had been born in Genoa, and was named after the supposed prince of Troy whom legend had made the founder of the city. Upon his release James was held to owe the Mahona an indemnity of 952,000 florins. Considering all the other expenses which the kings of Cyprus had to face, this was beyond the capacity of the Lusignan dynasty to meet.

James bequeathed this debt as well as the problem of recovering Famagusta to his son Janus, who succeeded neither in paying the one nor in solving the other. After his failure to retake Famagusta in a desultory siege, Janus sent to Genoa an envoy who managed to negotiate a "concord" with Boucicaut and the Council of Anziani. In late March, 1403, Boucicaut dispatched his friend and confidant l' Ermite de la Faye to Cyprus to demand of King Janus the surrender of Kyrenia as a pledge of good faith for his *observatio concordii* before the marshal should arrive in Cyprus with the Genoese fleet (which was, incidentally, financed by a new mahona). In Genoa at least the destination of the fleet seems to have been a well-kept secret, for on 24 March (1403) an agent of the mercantile house of Ardingo Ricci wrote the Valencian factors of the Pratese merchant Francesco Datini, "They are getting the fleet ready. Two ships are leaving today. Within fifteen days the galleys will go. No one knows where they're going. May God grant them victory!"⁶⁰

A resolution of the Venetian Senate of 4 April (1403), a few days before Manuel II left Venice on Mocenigo's galleys, was transmitted in

a letter to Carlo Zeno. Boucicaut had sailed that very day although the Senate had no means of knowing so.⁶¹ When Mocenigo reached the Morea, his three galleys would strengthen Carlo Zeno's fleet, which would then consist of thirteen galleys. From some vantage point (it would be Modon) Zeno was to watch the passage of the Genoese "armada," which the Senate knew to contain ten galleys (one of them a *grossa*), including the galley on which de la Faye had already sailed to Cyprus some days before. Boucicaut also had six large transports (*naves magne*) with 600 lances aboard, there being two men to a lance, and 600 horses besides two cogs (*coche*) which had left port earlier with 700 foot to join a Genoese naval force already in the Levant.⁶²

⁶¹ On Boucicaut's departure from Genoa, see Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII, col. 1197, who says that he had nine galleys, "among which are reckoned the three galleys sent ahead for the emperor of the Greeks," seven ships (*naves*), a *gallera grossa*, and a horse-transport (*uscherium*). Cf. the following note.

⁶² Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 94^r, dated 4 April, 1403: "Cum per ea que habemus de partibus Janue armata Januensis aut exivit aut exiet . . . , vadit pars quod in bona gratia scribatur et mandetur dicto capitaneo nostro quod in nomine Jesu Christi cum omnibus galeis sibi commissis et cum istis tribus aliis nostris galeis quas mittimus ad eius obedientiam sub capitaneatu Ser Leonardi Mocenigo ponendo bene omnes in puncto et in ordine debeat tenere modum omnino de inveniundo se suo posse in loco in quo videat transitum armate Januensis quam putamus per totum mensem Marcii elapsi exivisse de Janua, viz. numero galee novem et una grossa, quarum una dicitur ante per aliquos dies recessisse et ivisse ad sciendum intentionem domini regis Cipri si est contentus dare castrum de Cerines [Kyrenia] in fortia domini Bucichaldi pro pignore et observatione concordii tractati per ambaxiatorem dicti domini regis cum Januensibus. Dicitur etiam et asseritur quod simul cum dictis galeis debent exire de Janua sex naves magne cum sexcentis lanceis ad duos pro lancea cum equis sexcentis ultra alias duas cochas que ante recesserant cum VIIc. peditibus pro coniungendo se cum aliis suis galeis que sunt in partibus Levantis. . . ."

The Genoese *galea grossa* in Boucicaut's fleet was doubtless an armed merchant galley (cf. F. C. Lane, *Venice and History*, Baltimore, 1966, pp. 367–68). On 24 March the Senate had ordered the commander of a galley, "que est in partibus M'enie[?]," to sail toward Corfu to join the captain-general Zeno and thus add another galley to the Venetian fleet (Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 93).

The author of the *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chaps. XI–XII, pp. 621a, 622b, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chaps. cited, pp. 267a, 268a, says that Boucicaut left Genoa on 3 April with eight galleys, and that the hostile Venetians "si armèrent hastivement et sans révéler leur intention treize galées. . . ." According to the Venetian chronicler Antonio Morosini, Boucicaut began his expedition with twelve galleys and six armed cogs (*Chronique*, eds. Lefèvre-Pontalis and Dorez, I [1898], 26, 30). Em-

establish James I on the throne [of Cyprus]," as stated by Delaville Le Roulx, I, 431, but ten years earlier, on which note Louis de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, II (Paris, 1852, repr. Brussels and Famagusta, 1970), 366–68, and George Hill, *Hist. of Cyprus*, II (1948), 385–86, with references.

⁶⁰ Renato Piattoli, "La Spedizione del Maresciallo Boucicaut contro Cipro ed i suoi effetti dal carteggio di mercanti fiorentini," *Giornale storico e letterario della Liguria*, n.s., VI (1929), 134. This article is hereafter abbreviated as Piattoli, "Spedizione."

According to Boucicaut's biographer, he intended to use the fleet not only against the king (if that should prove necessary) but also against such infidels as he might find accessible by sea.⁶³

Boucicaut planned to stop first at Rhodes, there to await the results of l' Ermite de la Faye's mission to Cyprus. He had hardly "passed the kingdom of Naples," however, and entered the Ionian Sea when he learned of the existence of Carlo Zeno's fleet. At twenty miles from Modon he acquired the more precise information that Zeno had (according to the *Livre des faits*) thirteen galleys anchored in the shelter of Sapienza. Suspicious of the Venetians, he sent a herald ahead to make inquiries, but could ascertain nothing of their intentions. Boucicaut therefore approached Modon with his galleys ready for action, "en très belle ordonnance," and was doubtless surprised when the Venetians advanced to meet him "à grande joye et feste." Thereupon French, Genoese, and Venetians made their way together into port. The reception was so cordial, we are told, that the marshal divested himself of all suspicion of the hospitable Zeno. At Modon, Boucicaut found messengers from the Emperor Manuel, who "for God and in honor of chivalry" wished to confer with him before he resumed his voyage eastward, "for [the emperor] was in the Morea, twenty miles inland." Boucicaut immediately sent Jean de Châteaumorand and Giovanni Centurione d'Oltramare ahead to receive the emperor; it will be recalled that Centurione was the Genoese admiral in the Barbary Crusade.

Rounding Cape Matapan, Boucicaut himself awaited Manuel at Vasilipotamo. The emperor came with the empress and their children. "The said emperor asked him very gently," says

Boucicaut's biographer, "in honor of God and Christendom, that he should be willing to afford him comfort and passage as far as Constantinople. The marshal replied that he would do so most willingly, and whatever else he could. Thereupon he ordered four galleys to escort him, and he gave command of them to the good seigneur de Châteaumorand." Manuel was soon ready to depart, and the marshal himself went with the convoy to Cape S. Angelo (the Malean promontory), where messengers came to them from Zeno. The Venetians were willing, if Boucicaut so advised them, to add four galleys of their own to the Genoese squadron. His answer was "que ce seroit très bien fait, et grand honneur à la Seigneurie de Venise. . . ." Having lacked the means of getting home, Manuel could now sail off to the Bosphorus under the safeguard of eight galleys. He had set out from Constantinople three and one-half years before, and now came back on 9 June, 1403,⁶⁴ to what looked like a safer world than the one he had left. So far was John VII from opposing Manuel's return that he went out to Gallipoli to receive him, doubtless with appropriate honors.⁶⁵

Boucicaut was willing to tolerate this delay in reaching Cyprus, because he hoped that with sufficient time l' Ermite de la Faye would be successful in dealing with King Janus. According to his biographer, the marshal now set sail for Rhodes with his remaining four galleys (although he may have had six, plus the transports mentioned in the Venetian Senate's letter of 4 April to Zeno). The nine galleys, which Zeno still had left, followed Boucicaut doggedly: "when he went, they went; when he

manuele Piloti provides him with eight galleys and 2,500 men aboard ten "ships" (*naves*), for which see Pierre-Herman Dopp, ed., *Traité . . . sur le Passage en Terre Sainte* (1420), Louvain and Paris, 1958, p. 191.

⁶³ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. XI, p. 621a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, p. 267a: "Mais mieux ne luy sembla pouvoir employer son temps que sur els ennemis de la foy. Et pour ce délibéra son voyage à double intention: c' est à sçavoir sur le roy de Cypre, au cas à raison ne se mettroit, et puis contre les mescréans." Boucicaut's coming attacks upon Mamluk Syria would involve him in serious difficulties with Venice, on which see below, and cf. the brief sketch in Michel de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie: La France et l'Italie au temps du Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1936, pp. 259-80 (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 139).

⁶⁴ The date is provided by an unpublished work of Macarius, the metropolitan of Ancyra (Ankara), quoted by Paul Gautier, "Action de grâces de Démétrius Chrysoloras à la Théotocos pour l' anniversaire de la bataille d' Ankara (28 juillet 1403)," *Revue des études byzantines*, XIX (1961), 345-46. Gautier cites the work from Cod. Paris. gr. 1379, fol. 74. Note also Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 62, a payment of five *perperi* being made by the commune of Pera on 15 June, 1403, ". . . pro Bartholomeo Gallo, patrono unius bregantini armati, pro eundo obviam dominum imperatorem." Cf. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 237-38.

⁶⁵ On 23 June the commune of Pera disbursed nine *perperi* "pro Pambello de Spignano, et sunt pro expensis per eum et socios factis in cibo et potu, his diebus, quando fuerunt missi cum domino imperatore Calojane super galeam usque Galipolim, ubi tunc existerat dominus imperator Chir Manoli" (Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, I, 62). On the later history of John VII, see Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, pp. 238-45.

stopped, they stopped." The marshal is said to have been pleased by the fact that the Venetians were accompanying him, "et que tous d'un bon vouloir allassent courir sus aux mes-créans." He sent a messenger to inform Zeno that, when he had made peace with the king of Cyprus, he was going to attack the Moslems in what seemed to him an "emprise bonne et belle et honorable." By joining him in this crusade, Zeno could share the honor and glory that would redound to their combined efforts. The Venetian captain thanked him for this generous offer, and promised him an answer in two or three days, when he should have reached Rhodes. In the Hospitaller stronghold the grand master Philibert de Naillac received Boucicaut with appropriate honors, and conducted him into the palace [now restored by the Italians], "qui moult est bel et hault, assis au dessus de la ville. . . . Là mangèrent ensemble et parlèrent de plusieurs choses." Among the things they talked about, we may safely assume, were the Nicopolis Crusade and the situation in Cyprus.

Boucicaut was hardly ensconced in the palace when he received word from Zeno that the Venetian fleet could not join him in a campaign against the "Saracens." As captain-general of the fleet he would need—and did not have—authorization from the Signoria to embark upon such a venture. Despite the impression created by his biographer, it is hard to believe that Boucicaut expected any other answer. If he felt disappointment, however, it was certainly allayed by Châteaumorand's arrival with five galleys and three galiots (besides the four galleys of the imperial convoy to Constantinople). They had been provided by the commune of the Genoese at Pera, their compatriots on Chios, and the Gattilusio of Aenos and Mytilene. If Boucicaut had ten galleys to start with, as the Venetian Senate believed, he now had fifteen as well as three galiots and eight transports, because at this time l'Ermitte de la Faye arrived from Cyprus. He brought the disturbing news that he could not persuade King Janus to accept an "accord de paix." Boucicaut announced it meant war. He ordered his galley prepared, his horses put on board, and the army mobilized for the voyage to Cyprus. The Hospitallers were aghast at the prospect of another war between the Lusignan and the Genoese. The grand master asked Boucicaut to hold off, proposing himself to go to Cyprus to reason with Janus. When

Boucicaut agreed, "the master of Rhodes forthwith boarded his galley, and so did l'Ermitte de la Faye, who had his own galley, and the galley from Mytilene was to go with them, and thus with three galleys they went off to the king of Cyprus."⁶⁶

All this time Carlo Zeno had kept Boucicaut's fleet under close surveillance. He wrote the Venetian Senate from the islands of Patmos on 29 May and Stampalia (Astypalaea) on 14 June, describing Boucicaut's activities and his own up to the latter date. He naturally apprised the Senate of Philibert de Naillac's departure for Cyprus to see whether Janus could not be induced to meet the Genoese demands. A compromise would avoid a conflict which would deflect Boucicaut from his proposed "crusade," if we may apply the term to his proposed attacks upon the Mamluk coasts. Zeno's letters arrived in Parenzo on 6 July, carried by the galley *Trevisana*, and the Senate sent him an expression of their general approval four days later. They were also glad to learn that Zeno had written to the Venetian consul in Alexandria, who was undoubtedly instructed to inform the soldan's government in Cairo of Boucicaut's hostile intentions.⁶⁷

Zeno soon had more news for the Senate. Boucicaut was determined not to waste his time while the grand master was negotiating with Janus. Taking counsel with the Rhodian knights and with his Genoese officers, he decided to attack "un bel chastel et ville que on nomme Lescandelour," the Turkish port of Alanya (Arabic 'Alāyā), the Italian Candeloro, on the eastern shore of the Gulf of Adalia. It was a commercial center and a well-defended fortress, conveniently on Boucicaut's way to Cyprus. His biographer says that he landed 800 knights and squires, *gens de grande eslite*; all told,

⁶⁶ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chaps. XII–XIV, pp. 622–24, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chaps. cited, pp. 268–70. Carlo Zeno's grandson and biographer Jacopo Zeno, bishop of Feltre and Belluno (1447–1460) and later of Padua (until his death in 1481), *Vita Caroli Zeni*, VIII, ed. Gasparo Zonta, in the new Muratori, *RIS*, XIX, pt. 6 (1941, repr. 1968), 101–2, also recounts Boucicaut's invitation to join him in a campaign against the Moslems in Syria and Zeno's declination because only the Venetian Senate could exercise the *belli pacisque iura*. The account of the Emperor Manuel's return to Constantinople in G. Schlumberger, *Byzance et croisades* (1927), pp. 137–42, merely follows Berger de Xivrey and incorporates his errors. Delaville Le Roulx, I (1886), 424–26, is preferable.

⁶⁷ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XXVII, pp. 114–15, letter of the Senate to Zeno, dated 10 July, 1403.

he had about 3,000 combatants, eager for "the success of the Christian faith and to increase their renown." On the second day of the assault the forces of which Châteaumorand had been given the command seized the harbor and lower town; the Genoese plundered the warehouses, and burned nine vessels in the anchorage. The emir of the place was at five days' distance, making war in Turkish fashion upon his brother. Hurrying back, he met only bafflement and defeat as he tried to strike at his Christian assailants. He begged Boucicaut for peace, promising "that he would always be his friend, and the friend of the Genoese also—he would render him every service he could, and offered his power and lordship to aid him against the king of Cyprus." Since Boucicaut was still uncertain whether or not he was going to find himself at war with Janus—and Candeloro would be an excellent source of supplies—he and his counselors accepted the emir's proposal of peace and friendship. The valiant crusaders apparently found nothing incongruous about accepting Moslem assistance against a Christian prince. Two weeks after their landing in Candeloro they reboarded their galleys with a feeling of achievement.⁶⁸

The news was immediately forthcoming that Philibert de Naillac, l' Ermite de la Faye, and other interested persons had brought King Janus to terms in Cyprus. By a treaty signed at the royal palace in Nicosia on 7 July, 1403, "in the small room which overlooks the street by the river," Janus undertook to reimburse the New Mahona to the extent of 150,000 gold ducats "for whatever losses and expenses have thus far been caused the Genoese." In other words Janus was to pay the costs of Boucicaut's expedition up to the date of the agreement. As a guarantee that he would discharge this obligation Janus was immediately to deposit with the grand master and the convent of Rhodes 70,000 ducats' worth of jewels and gold and silver plate. Crown property was to serve as collateral for the remaining 80,000 ducats, and public instruments to this effect were to be held

by the master and convent "in secure custody." The whole indemnity was to be paid in annual instalments of 15,000 ducats; the jewels and plate would be returned to Janus *pari passu* with his liquidation of the debt. Penalties were provided for default. Boucicaut was himself to be adjudicator of the question of war-guilt, i.e., whether the Genoese expedition had in fact been unjustified (*si injusta fuerit causa dicte armate*). If so, some or all of the pledge of jewels and plate and the money paid would be restored to Janus, but since Boucicaut had organized the expedition, his judgment on this point could be anticipated.

Boucicaut was also to reconsider the late King James's unfulfilled obligations, which Janus had called *illa gravia et importabilia sibi et regno suo*. Here, too, the marshal's word was to be law. Captives taken by both sides in the recent conflict were to be released. Confiscated property was to be restored. Finally, Janus agreed to make annual payments to the Old Mahona of 121,000 "old bezants of Nicosia" (about 30,000 ducats) until he had discharged this long-standing indebtedness. Here again, however, Boucicaut might lessen the amount to be paid each year and thus lengthen the period of payment.⁶⁹ Famagusta of course remained in the hands of the Genoese, to whose commercial monopoly the Venetian merchant Emanuele Piloti attributed the decline of the port.⁷⁰

Despite some face-saving clauses, the treaty meant that Janus had capitulated. Boucicaut's acceptance was a foregone conclusion; he had probably dictated the essential terms to Philibert de Naillac before the latter's departure for Cyprus. Eager to begin operations against the "mescréans," Boucicaut made a hurried four days' visit to Cyprus "pour certifier et confirmer la paix." His biographer assures us that Janus received him with great honor, which is very likely, and wanted to give him 25,000 ducats as a gesture of esteem, which is less likely. In any event the marshal is said to have refused the money; instead he asked Janus to give him men-at-arms and

⁶⁸ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chaps. xv–xvii, pp. 624–27, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chaps. cited, pp. 270–73. The Venetian chronicler Antonio Morosini states that Boucicaut withdrew his forces from Candeloro, because they had been "so badly mauled" (*Chronique*, I [1898], 56, 58, *si mal tratady*). The two weeks they spent there ran from 29 June to 12 July (*ibid.*, I, 60, 65, notes). Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII, cols. 1199E–1200A, has also described the Genoese attack upon Candeloro.

⁶⁹ Mas Latrie, *Hist. de l' île de Chypre*, II, 466–71, with notices in Delaville Le Roulx, I, 431–32, and Hill, *Hist. of Cyprus*, II, 454–55.

⁷⁰ Piloti, *Traité . . . sur le Passage en Terre Sainte* (1420), Louvain and Paris, 1958, pp. 126–28, and ed. Baron de Reiffenberg, in the *Monuments pour servir à l' histoire des provinces de Namur, de Hainaut et de Luxembourg*, IV (1846), 366–67 (see above, Chapter 14, note 136).

galleys, "and the king replied that he would do so willingly." Janus did give him two galleys, we are told, "although one of them disappeared, because the crew were corsairs." Prevented by adverse winds from landing at Alexandria and attacking the city which Peter I of Lusignan had left in ruins almost forty years before, Boucicaut turned his attention to the coastal towns of Syria. He announced Tripoli as his objective, and was determined to go there "notwithstanding the fact that the Genoese advised him to return to Genoa, and said that he had done enough." Boucicaut had already informed Carlo Zeno that, when peace had been achieved in Cyprus, he intended to proceed against "les ennemis de la foy:" his biographer insists that the Venetians had broadcast his hostile intentions "par toutes les terres des Sarrasins . . . tant en Égypte comme en Syrie."

After a costly attempt to take Tripoli, where the port and shoreline were "covered with Saracens," who were waiting to receive him, Boucicaut moved some miles south to Botron (al-Batrūn) which, lacking an adequate defense, was pillaged and burned.⁷¹ The Moslem inhabitants were "tous mis à mort." Continuing south, the fleet arrived before Beirut on the morning of 10 August, 1403. The Genoese had just captured a Venetian *gripperie*, a small, fast cutter with some two dozen oars. The skipper confessed after some persuasion that he was spreading the news of the "the marshal's coming," throughout Mamluk territory. Beirut was also sacked and put to the torch, to the vast indignation of the Venetians, whose warehouses were plundered of 500 bales or bundles (*coly*) of spices worth 30,000 ducats.⁷²

⁷¹ Boucicaut's attacks upon Tripoli and Botron occupied 7-9 August. They are both omitted from Antonio Morosini's account, but are mentioned by the contemporary Moslem chroniclers (cf. the notes of Lefèvre-Pontalis in the *Chronique d' Antonio Morosini*, I [1898], 64-65). The author of the *Livre des faits* describes at length the heroism of the French and Genoese at Tripoli, where they were victorious but did not attempt to hold the port. Emmanuele Piloti, however, says that Boucicaut met such opposition in the first landing of troops at Tripoli that he fled from the scene (Pierre-Herman Dopp, ed., *Traité . . . sur le Passage en Terre Sainte* [1420], Louvain and Paris, 1958, p. 197), which fact is confirmed by Bernardo Morosini, Venetian vice-bailie in Cyprus, in a letter dated 21 August to the colonial government of Candia for transmission to Venice (the text of the letter is given in Marino Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII [1733], cols. 800-1).

⁷² *Chronique d' Antonio Morosini*, eds. Lefèvre-Pontalis and Dorez, I, 62-70; cf. Piloti, *Traité*, ed. Dopp, p. 197, and

The city was one of the centers of Venetian trade in the far-eastern Mediterranean (the other being Alexandria). Boucicaut had the booty from Beirut sent to Famagusta, where it was all sold at auction to the obvious advantage of the Genoese, a fact which the author of the *Livre des faits* glosses over in silence.⁷³

The marshal's next objective was "Sayète," the ancient Sidon (medieval Sagitta, Arabic *Saidā*). He found the port "bien fourny de Sarrasins, qui en belle bataille l' attendoient," more than 12,000 of them on horse and foot. The good squire Jean d' Ony led a landing party, but contrary winds and a rough sea impeded the operation. Boucicaut's biographer compares the crusaders' efforts to those of Leonidas with his 300 "knights" at Thermopylae against the host of Xerxes, king of Persia. The fighting lasted five hours. As at Tripoli, Boucicaut's forces are alleged to have taken the port, but it would have been impracticable to try to hold it.

Taking to the sea again, the Christian raiders were driven by the winds in a northerly direction to "La Liche," the ancient Laodicea (medieval Lichia, Arabic al-Lādhīqīyah). The fleet had become separated during the night. Boucicaut had only a quarter of his galleys on hand for action. Many of his men were sick and wounded. He sent Giovanni Centurione in a galley to take a close look at the two towers which guarded the entrance to the harbor; he wanted to make a landing the following morning, and in the meantime he pulled his other galleys farther offshore. There seemed to be no more than 3,000 Saracens in the defense force. Mistaking the withdrawal of the galleys for a retreat, however, and wanting Boucicaut to leave, the Saracen commanders brought their men out of ambush "from behind a highland and a wooded area . . . between the town and the port." Actually there were "a full 30,000

Bernardo Morosini's letter of 21 August in Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, cols. 800-1: "[Bucicaldo e i Genovesi] rubarono balle 200 di boccasini e colli 200 in 250 di spezie nostre, abbrugiando le case de' nostri fattori, le quali prima furono messe a saccomano." M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d' Italie* (1936), p. 268, erroneously dates Boucicaut's arrival at Beirut on 19 August, in which he is followed by Dopp, *op. cit.*, p. 197, note.

⁷³ Somewhat later in his narrative, however, the author does mention that the Venetians had suffered at Beirut "trop grand dommage en leurs marchandises" (*Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, p. II, chap. xxv, p. 635a, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, p. 280a). With the news of the sack of Beirut the price of cotton rose in Italy (Piatoli, "Spedizione," p. 135).

Saracens, who all came down to the shore, yelling and screaming like devils from hell." Recovering from their astonishment, Boucicaut and his Genoese followers "looked upon it as a miracle of our Lord, who of his grace had wanted to save them."⁷⁴

Boucicaut saw that further effort against the Moslems would be futile. His forces were inadequate, many of his men sick and wounded, and his galleys doubtless the worse for wear. In late August he sailed for Famagusta, where he spent eight or ten days attending to various details of the Cypriote treaty of 7 July,⁷⁵ and then went on to Rhodes, "où le grand maistre du dit lieu moult l'honnora et festoya." Philibert de Naillac had accompanied him on the Syrian raids, but had preceded him home. According to the *Livre des faits*, Boucicaut loaded three ships (*naves*) with the sick and wounded, "of whom there were a great number, knights and squires as well as archers, varlets, and mariners." He is said to have put most of his men-at-arms aboard the three ships "pour les conduire et gouverner," retaining only a small company of knights and twelve to fourteen hundred archers for the return voyage to Genoa. One of the three ships was lost off the Sicilian coast, apparently with all aboard. It was September. Boucicaut had to leave, "for already the time was drawing near when the sea often became heavy because of the change of winds." During the ten or twelve days he spent at Rhodes, Boucicaut dispatched 500 men in two large ships to Alexandria in a useless display of naval prowess. Notwithstanding the events of the preceding month Pollo Arqua, the captain, was to ask for peace. The Mamluks were incensed; it took Arqua three months to accomplish his mission. Piloti, who lived in Alexandria, says that the soldan an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Faraj demanded an indemnity of 30,000 ducats, and that Boucicaut's ill-managed expedition had ruined both the

trade and the reputation of the Genoese in Egypt and Syria. He adds, however, that if Boucicaut had attacked Alexandria with his ten ships and fourteen galleys immediately after his first arrival in Rhodes (at the beginning of June), he would have taken the city with great profit to Christendom and great honor to himself, "de quoy il fist tout le contraire."⁷⁶

What followed was to become one of the better-known episodes in the adventurous career of Carlo Zeno as well as in the annals of Venetian-Genoese enmity. In the raid on Beirut of 10 August, Boucicaut had seized 500 bundles or small bales of spices, as we have seen, together with 5,000 ducats belonging to Venetians and a small ship of about 115 tons (*una . . . navetta di botte 180*) belonging to Bernardo Morosini, the Venetian vice-bailie in Cyprus. The ship was loaded with at least 84 bales of cargo. Although the Venetian factors had fled the scene, at least one Venetian, Ser Lorenzo Orso, did go to Boucicaut, and warned him "che quelle cose erano de' Veneziani." Boucicaut replied that, although there was peace between Venice and Genoa, he was within his rights in taking what he found in enemy territory.⁷⁷

Upon learning of what Morosini called the "robbery" (*ruberia*) at Beirut, Carlo Zeno immediately protested to Boucicaut. The marshal is said to have answered that for more than a year the Venetians had been well aware of the challenge he had sent to the soldan of Egypt, who had arrested Genoese merchants in Cairo, Damascus, and Alexandria, and mulcted them in shameful disregard of the safe-conducts he had granted them. Boucicaut had warned the Venetians (according to the *Livre des faits*) ten months before his departure from Genoa to remove their goods and merchandise from Mamluk territory. And as for Beirut, he had found the city empty. There were no Venetians on hand to claim this or that property as theirs. He could not believe that he had done them any damage. His purpose was not to assail Christians, but only the enemies of the faith. Besides, if he had known that his forces had

⁷⁴ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chaps. XVIII-XXIII, pp. 627-34, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chaps. cited, pp. 273-79; see also, as noted in the preceding references, the valuable but discursive, repetitious, and somewhat inaccurate *Chronique d'Antonio Morosini*, I, 26-70, and the tighter but less informative *Traité d'Emmanuel Piloti sur le Passage en Terre Sainte*, pp. 190-201.

⁷⁵ Cf. Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XXVIII, p. 118, letter of Boucicaut to King Janus, dated at Famagusta on 28 August, 1403, requesting him to appear in Genoa or to send a representative before 1 May, 1404, for final settlement of certain aspects of the treaty to which Janus still took exception.

⁷⁶ Piloti, *Traité*, ed. Dopp, pp. 199-201, and ed. Reiffenberg, *Monuments*, IV, 398-400; *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. XXIV, p. 634, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, p. 279.

⁷⁷ Morosini's letter of 21 August, in Sanudo, *Vite de'duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, col. 801; Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XXIX, p. 119. On ships' "tonnage," see F. C. Lane, *Venice and History*, Baltimore, 1966, pp. 351-58, 366.

seized Venetian property, if indeed they had, he would certainly have ordered it to be restored.⁷⁶ Was Morosini misinformed? Had Lorenzo Orso really given Boucicaut to understand that the merchandise in question belonged to the Venetians? Long after the event Boucicaut would still claim he had not known.

As Boucicaut had an apologist in the author of the *Livre des faits*, so Zeno later found one in his grandson Jacopo, whose *Vita Caroli Zeni* gives us a different but no more convincing recital of alleged facts. Jacopo says there had been Venetians in Beirut. They had fled for their lives. Boucicaut had flagrantly violated the peace which (since the treaty of Turin in 1381) had existed between Genoa and Venice. Zeno acted throughout with reason and restraint although he saw clearly, says Jacopo, that Boucicaut was seeking to transform the peoples of the two republics from friends and allies into the bitterest enemies. Boucicaut bridled at the thought of making restitution for the losses which the Venetians had suffered at Beirut, cursed them roundly, inveighed against the *respublica Veneta*, and rejected appeal after appeal which Zeno sent him by envoy after envoy. Although it seemed as though the dignity of the Venetian Senate could only be preserved *armis et sanguine*, the upright Zeno decided not to have recourse to war. Leaving Egyptian waters and traversing the "Cretan sea," Zeno returned to Greece. From the anchorage at Modon he would protect the possessions of Venice. If Boucicaut should attack him, the die would be cast, but not by him.⁷⁹

Already on 4 August (1403) the Senate had instructed Zeno to keep with him the fourteen galleys then under his command, which included the *Trevisana*, the galleys of Crete, and the three assigned to Leonardo Mocenigo. The galley of Negroponte, well armed and well equipped with rowers and archers, was also to be put at Zeno's disposal. The colonial government of Crete should be directed to prepare the hull of another galley for arming in case Zeno should need it. And, finally, he was authorized to proceed against Boucicaut and the Genoese, if he could do so safely, in the event of their making attacks upon Venetian

shipping.⁸⁰ Now, on 25 September, since the pillage of Beirut was well known, the Senate agreed that it was inconsistent with the honor and reputation of the state to tolerate the grievous injuries and heavy losses which the Genoese under Boucicaut had inflicted upon them. If Zeno learned that the Genoese had caused loss or damage to the Venetian commercial galleys of Romania, the cogs of Tana, or any others, he was to attack and capture their galleys and all other such ships as he could, whether they were armed or unarmed, *et ipsos tractare et de ipsis facere tanquam de publicis inimicis nostre dominationis*. To be sure of success, he was to attack only when he was certain of possessing a stronger naval force than that of his opponents.⁸¹ The Senate was cautious, however, for entanglement with Genoa could lead to involvement with France. When the proposal was made to allow Zeno to add to his fleet (if he thought it necessary) the two galleys of Romania and at least one or two more from Crete, the proponents of the measure apparently could not muster sufficient votes, and their resolution was not put into effect.⁸²

Setting forth from Rhodes and skirting Venetian-held Crete, Boucicaut sailed with eleven galleys for Cape S. Angelo on the eastern prong of the Morea, where he arrived on Thursday, 4 October, 1403. The next day he crossed the Gulf of Marathonisi to Porto Quaglio on the eastern shore of Cape Matapan, where he spent the night. On the morning of 6 October his fleet continued westward to the island of Sapienza, a mile or so south of the Venetian station at Modon. Again the sailors dropped anchor for the night, and lighted their beacons. In nearby Porto Longo, Carlo Zeno had been lying in wait for him with eleven galleys. Zeno now ordered two armed *galere grosse*, merchant galleys of the Tana run which had just arrived in Modon, to join his fleet and thus increase its strength to thirteen galleys. He had also posted troops along the shore to prevent Boucicaut from landing. Three days later Zeno was to complain that such had been the "arrogance" of the Genoese that they had

⁸⁰ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxvi, pp. 111-13.

⁸¹ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 107.

⁸² *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 108. The crosses in the left-hand margin of the register, which indicate the enactment of a resolution, are entirely lacking here. Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxix, pp. 119-22, has published this document, and used it (*ibid.*, I, 450), under the mistaken assumption that it constitutes the Senate's instructions to Zeno.

⁷⁶ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. xxv, p. 635, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, p. 280.

⁷⁹ Jacopo Zeno, *Vita Caroli Zeni*, VIII, ed. Zonta, in *RISS*, XIX-6, 102-3.

not notified him of their coming, which he had interpreted as a "segnale di mal' animo e di mal volere." On Sunday morning, 7 October, Boucicaut's galleys sailed northward some miles toward the Bocca de Zonchio (Old Navarino). Zeno put his flagship between the two *galere grosse*, and followed them under oars.

As Zeno described the scene two days later, in a letter of 9 October to the Doge Michele Steno, the Genoese galleys suddenly turned, and bore down upon him. At first Zeno thought that Boucicaut was sending a galley to him for converse and as a gesture of courtesy. He would have received it "amichevolmente," as he had done on an earlier occasion. Here was a good opportunity to settle peacefully the indemnity for the "ruberia" at Beirut. The massed Genoese galleys advanced in full force, however, with obviously hostile intent. The Venetians met the attack courageously, as Zeno wrote the doge, and there ensued a "battaglia aspra e forte tra l' una parte e l' altra." The engagement was furious. It lasted about four hours. By the grace of God and the Evangelist S. Mark—we have Zeno's word for it—the Venetians defeated Boucicaut's French and Genoese forces. Boucicaut lost three of his galleys; the other eight withdrew from the conflict in utter disorder.

The Genoese suffered many casualties, according to Zeno, "and if all our men had done their duty, not one of their galleys would have got away." When he returned to Venice, he wanted the doge to institute an inquiry by the Avvogatori del Comune to see to the punishment of those whose poor performance had robbed him of a complete victory. He could not pursue the fleeing Genoese galleys. Some of his men were wounded, others exhausted. In the heat of combat, however, he had lashed his flagship to that of Boucicaut, who had 280 to 300 combatants aboard. The marshal's men were beaten back to the gunnels, at which point two Genoese galleys came to his rescue. They attacked Zeno's galley, one at the prow, the other on the starboard side of the poop-deck. For more than an hour his men fought the Genoese in hand-to-hand combat, with the three galleys tied together. Zeno's rowers were killed. The press was so great that the ship's rail was broken, and men fell into the water.

With the enemy aboard his galley, no one came to Zeno's assistance except Leonardo Mocenigo, at which point Boucicaut's men detached the grapnels binding his galley to

Zeno's. If only a brigantine, let alone a galley, had intervened to cut him off (according to Zeno), Boucicaut himself might have been captured. His bowmen took to the oars, however, to help row his galley out of the fray. Zeno had been in the thick of it for two hours. There were hardly thirty men on his galley who were not wounded. With the co-operation of his officers Zeno might have achieved (he says) the victory he had hoped for and indeed expected. At least, he believed, he had maintained the honor of the Republic, and he had taught the Genoese a lesson they would not soon forget. He had taken 400 prisoners, including the skippers of the three galleys he had captured. They were mostly oarsmen and footsoldiers, but there were also French knights among them, of whom the most notable was Jean de Châteaumorand.⁸³

The chronicler Morosini adds that, when the Venetians unloaded the captured galleys, they found much silver and coined money and about 50 *pondi* of spices, including eleven cartons of pepper, five of cloves, and six of cinnamon. They were all put under lock and key, sealed with the state stamp, to be kept in the custody of the castellan and councillors of Modon. The Genoese prisoners protested that the spices had been purchased at Famagusta, and were not part of Boucicaut's spoils at Beirut. They were told that all the merchandise on the galleys would be retained until the facts could be determined.⁸⁴

Immediately after the battle Boucicaut continued westward with his crippled fleet (still on 7 October). Although he had lost three galleys to the Venetians, he dismissed the two galleys he still had from Chios and Rhodes (according to the Venetian accounts), for there was no

⁸³ Zeno's letter of 9 October is given in Venetian by Antonio Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 124–44, and in Italian by Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, cols. 801–4. The account in Morosini, *ibid.*, I, 78–96, 148, is based upon Zeno's letter, but honestly recognizes Zeno as the one who took the offensive. The letter may also have inspired the windy and almost worthless description of the battle in Jacopo Zeno, *Vita Caroli Zeni*, VIII, in *RISS*, XIX–6 (1940–41), 104–10, who depicts Boucicaut as a villainous aggressor, whose "stealthy" approach to Sapienza was designed to catch his grandfather unprepared for an attack. On the process which the Avvogatori brought into the Maggior Consiglio against the galley commanders who failed Zeno, see Morosini, I, 158, 160. The battle is also described by the Genoese chronicler Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII, cols. 1200C–1201A.

⁸⁴ Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 146, followed by Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, cols. 804–5.

need of their going on to Genoa. Having suffered heavy casualties, he had to disarm another galley in order to provide full crews for his remaining galleys. Thus it is that Morosini and his successors speak of Boucicaut's return to Genoa with only five (armed) galleys. Morosini says that they now set sail for home "with little joy" (*chon puocha alegreza*), and Boucicaut's biographer acknowledges "that they did not seem like people returning from a feast or a dance." Somewhere along the way, however, they had the satisfaction of capturing, on 11 October, a Venetian cog and a merchant galley loaded with oars, tackle, and ship's biscuit.⁸⁵ They landed in Genoa on Monday, 29 October.⁸⁶

When his men had regained strength and his galleys were restored to order, Carlo Zeno left Modon for a brief cruise in the Ionian Sea to make certain that Boucicaut's fleet was on its way to Genoa. Then he went on to Venice, where the two *galere grosse* had preceded him, with Châteaumorand and thirty-four other French knights and squires (*tous gens d' eslite*, says the author of the *Livre des faits*). They were imprisoned in the "Torexela," the tower which still rose over the southeast corner of the doge's palace (the present Armory), by the Ponte della Paglia. Here they were kept until the conclusion of peace. On the evening of 24 October torches were lighted in the belfry of the campanile to celebrate the victory over Boucicaut at Modon. The heat melted the lead on the roofing, and ruined the three bells by which the Venetians regulated their daily activities. The top of the tower had to be entirely reconstructed, and now for the first time the roof was gilded. Then an old adage was recalled that before the Venetians could take Padua, the tallest tower in Venice would burn and be rebuilt.⁸⁷

Boucicaut encouraged Genoese privateers to

prey on Venetian shipping, and naval warfare between the two republics ranged from Cadiz and Valencia in the west to Pera, Sozopolis, and Alexandria in the east. The government of Charles VI, however, directed Boucicaut and the Council of Anziani to secure the release of the French prisoners in the Torresella. First, Cattaneo Cigalla was sent to Venice. The chronicler Morosini describes him as wise, kindly, and handsome. On 30 November, 1403, the Venetian Senate voted him a safe-conduct, which was promptly issued in the doge's name.⁸⁸ Genoese depredations on the high seas had been extensive, Venetian losses considerable.⁸⁹ There were many thorny issues to settle. Cigalla was eloquent, reasonable, and dexterous. The Venetians were exercised about Boucicaut's seizure of their merchandise at Beirut. They would not compromise on their right to trade freely in Mamluk territory. Cigalla frankly admitted that right-minded citizens in Genoa regretted profoundly the Venetian losses at Beirut. If restitution was among the terms of the proposed peace (as it would be), they were prepared to make full amends. The fact was, of course, that they had been at war with the Saracens, and had warned the Venetians, so that precautions might be taken to avoid precisely such untoward events. Certainly the Venetians realized that when men-at-arms attacked, there was no telling them to take this and to leave that. But the Genoese would make good. After all, in the past they had been obliged to make similar claims for restitution from Venice.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 117: "Capta: Quod respondeatur isti domino Cataneo Cigala sindaco et ambasiatori domini gubernatoris [Boucicaut] et consilii Ancianorum ac comunis Janue quod receptis litteris sue nobilitatis per quas requirit ut sibi mittamus nostrum saluum conductum sub cuius securitate possit venire ad nostram presentiam deliberavimus ipsum sibi facere et mittere presentibus interclusum." The text of the safe conduct follows in the register. On the French demand for the release of the prisoners, note Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 112, 114.

⁸⁶ Cf. Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 100, 102, 110, 112, 148 ff., who exaggerates the monetary value of the Venetian losses, and Piattoli, "Spedizione," pp. 136-37.

⁸⁷ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 120^v, dated 15 December, 1403: "... De dannis Baruti respondit [Cigalla] quod danna ipsa displicuerunt multum bonis civibus Janue et quod si per formam pacis emendare illa tenebantur, ipsi parati erant emendare, et quod bene videretur, subiungendo quod veritas rei erat quod ipsi erant in guerra cum Saracenis et quod de hoc previsor nos fecerant ut servarentur tales modi quod scandala non possent oriri inter nos . . . , quia bene sciebamur quod quando gentes armorum ibant in talibus non poterant regulari et accipere

⁸⁸ Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 92, 100, 148; *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. XXVII, pp. 638-39, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, p. 283; Vincenzo Joppi, ed., "Cronachetta veneziana dal 1402 al 1415," *Archivio veneto*, XVII (IX, 1879), 304-5.

⁸⁹ Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, ad ann. 1403, in *RISS*, XVII, 1201B, with note 96. The mercantile correspondence of the firm of Ricci in Genoa records Boucicaut's return (*tornò qui il ghovernatore chon 5 ghalee*), and contains some speculation as to whether war would follow, but later reports with relief that negotiations for peace were under way (Piattoli, "Spedizione," p. 136).

⁹⁰ Antonio Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 108, 110, 162, followed by Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, col. 806.

The Venetians were demanding 32,000 ducats in damages, which Cigalla could not accept. The situation became more complicated on 31 December when he informed the Senate that John, the duke of Berry, had ordered the arrest of the Venetian merchants in Montpellier, and that it was possible his example might be followed in other parts of France.⁹¹ By the end of January, 1404, however, when Cigalla had gone far toward satisfying the Venetians and maintaining the rights of his own countrymen, Boucicaut and the Anziani appointed Domenico Imperiali to join him as a second envoy. If Cigalla was thought in some quarters to have conceded too much, the prime purpose of his mission was to secure the release of the prisoners in Venice. Since the Genoese government was slow in acting upon the proposals which Cigalla had sent them, he requested a "prorogation" of his safe-conduct, which the Senate voted to extend to 15 February. Two days later they voted a similar safe-conduct to Imperiali and the staff of ten persons he was supposed to bring with him.⁹² Two weeks later, when Imperiali still had not arrived, the Senate on 14 February again extended the safe-conduct for him as well as for Cigalla until the end of the month.⁹³

By this time the Senate had lost faith in the proceedings, and took steps to protect the interests of the state. From 9 to 16 February various proposals were debated, some of which were accepted, others rejected, to quicken Venetian vigilance throughout the Adriatic and in the region of Corfu, provide funds where they were needed, reassure their subjects overseas, and send new instructions to the castellans

istud ac dimittere illud, subiungendo quod ipsi etiam habebant a nobis petere."

Note also the reply which the Senate had given Cigalla two days earlier (on 13 December), in which they disclaimed responsibility for the naval encounter at Modon, emphasized the losses which the Genoese had unwarrantably caused Venice, and declared "quod habeamus justissimam causam retinendi vestrates [i. e., holding the Genoese and French prisoners] et galeas et res captas ad bellum" (Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxii, pt. 1, pp. 129-30). The other proposed answers to Cigalla (and amendments thereto) published by Delaville Le Roulx, *ibid.*, II, no. xxxii, pts. II-V, pp. 130-34, were rejected by the Senate.

⁹¹ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fol. 126^v, and see Delaville Le Roulx, I, 463, note 4, and II, no. xxxiii, pp. 135-41, resolutions passed by the Senate on 18 December.

⁹² Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fols. 128^v-129^r, dated 29 and 31 January, 1404.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, fol. 131^v.

in the critical posts at Modon and Coron. Ship's biscuit was said to be low in Modon and entirely lacking in Negroponte. Foodstuffs and fodder were in short supply in Crete and elsewhere. The Senate directed their notary in Ragusa to seek permission for a "few men" from the Venetian galleys to enter the well-walled and heavily guarded city to purchase bread, wine, and meat at the markets in the public square. They agreed to strike at the Genoese wherever they could reach them, especially "in aquis et partibus Sicilie." It was urged, but apparently not voted, that the masters of the Arsenal should hasten the completion of the hulls of four galleys, of the dimensions of the Flanders galleys, to add to the fleet. It was voted, however, to elect a captain-general of the sea, another *provveditore*, and eight *sopracomiti* or commanders of galleys, for it was becoming clear that by keeping their ambassadors in Venice the Genoese were trifling with them to gain time, and really had no intention of making peace.⁹⁴

This impression was strengthened when Domenico Imperiali arrived in Venice, for he wished to go over the same ground the Senate had already trod with Cigalla. They made clear, however, they had no intention of retracing their steps. They rejected Imperiali's charges against Carlo Zeno, on which score Cigalla had already conveyed their answer to Boucicaut and the Anziani. They had already held *longa pratica et discussio* with Cigalla, and now renewed their demands for restitution of the ships which the Genoese had seized in Cadiz, Iviza, Alexandria, Tenedos, and "in illis partibus Romanie . . . [et] Calabrie."⁹⁵ Having taken this stand on 23 February, the Senate extended the limits of the Genoese envoys' safe-conducts until 8 March. Since he could wring no better terms from the Venetians,

⁹⁴ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 1, fols. 129^v-132^v, dated 9 to 16 February, 1404: ". . . Unde cum manifestissime comprehendatur per claras experientias et evidentissima signa quod Januenses non habent bonam intentionem ad concordium et pacem nobiscum, sed vadunt disimulando et tenendo nos in verbis pro faciendo et ponendo facta sua in ordine ad danna nostra, nam hic tenuerunt suum ambasiatorem . . . sub fictione tractate pacis, et non cessarunt nec cessant facere capi nostra navigia . . . , vadit pars quod . . . debeat eligi capitaneus generalis maris et unus provisor . . . et octo supracomiti qui omnes eligantur . . . per scrutinium in consiliis Rogatorum et Additionis [the Senate and the Giunta] . . ." (*ibid.*, fol. 132^v, dated 16 February).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 134, dated 23 February, 1404 (Ven. style 1403).

Imperiali returned (on 26 February) to the articles of peace on which the Senate had already agreed with Cigalla.⁹⁶

The next day the safe-conducts were prorogued to 15 March. Negotiations seemed to be going very well, but the Venetians were suspicious of every concession the Genoese made. On Friday, 29 February, the Senate ordered the preparation of the four *galee grosse* then in the Arsenal, and decided that the eight *sopracomiti* should be elected on Sunday, 2 March. Nevertheless, they voted down once more the proposal to arm the four galleys *de mensura Flandrie*.⁹⁷ They promised Charles VI and the royal dukes in Paris a true account of the capture of the French and Genoese nobles at Modon and the reasons for their retention in Venice, for obviously the French court had been misinformed. In the meantime a swift courier had carried the proposed articles of peace to Boucicaut and the twelve Anziani, and on 13 March the Genoese envoys reported that they were expecting a reply "from day to day."⁹⁸ The reply came on the seventeenth, giving Imperiali and Cigalla full powers to sign a treaty in accord with the articles of which they had apprised the marshal,⁹⁹ who was finding it hard to contain his rage.

The treaty was formally concluded on Saturday, 22 March, 1404, in the chapel of S. Niccolò in the doge's palace on the Bacino. The text identifies Domenico Imperiali as the chief Genoese negotiator. The two republics intended to preserve the peace inviolably, it is said, because war between them was intolerably damaging to them both "and ruinous to all Christendom . . . , since it is well known to all the world that, had it not been—and were it not still—for the resistance and strength of the said two states, the infidels would have sub-

jected to their power a large part of Christendom many years ago." Both sides agreed to a mutual pardon or forgiveness for all offenses and the remission of all penalties. The Genoese promised to pay 3,300 florins for the losses they had caused the Venetians at Famagusta and Rhodes and to make financial or other amends for the merchandise and other property they had taken at Beirut. The Venetians would restore the three galleys (with all their tackle and oars) which Carlo Zeno had captured at Modon. Likewise the Genoese would return the galley or galleys they had taken as well as the various ships (*naves*) and cogs (*cochae*), with all the goods, merchandise, and money aboard, which they had seized at Cadiz, Iviza, and Alexandria, and in Greece and Syria.

Each of the high contracting parties agreed to release all persons captured as a consequence of the recent events. The French nobles in the Torresella were to take an oath in writing, with their seals attached, never to seek "emenda vel satisfactio" from either Venice or her subjects, for their imprisonment had been part of the fortunes of war. Imperiali and Cigalla promised that they would address themselves *totis viribus* to Charles VI and John of Berry to secure the release of the Venetian merchants then being held in Montpellier. The Venetians who had lost cotton at Tripoli and salt in Cyprus might claim compensation in Genoa, where (according to Imperiali and Cigalla) full justice would be done them. Both sides were to notify their officials and subjects everywhere that hostilities must cease as soon as possible. The terms of the treaty of Turin of 8 August, 1381, were put back into effect, and if either side broke the "concord" which now existed between them, it would incur a penalty of 20,000 gold florins. When afternoon had turned into evening, *hora prima noctis*, the representatives of both Venice and Genoa swore, with their hands on the gospels, to heed, observe, and fulfill forever and in good faith the foregoing provisions of the treaty.¹⁰⁰ The

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 135^r: ". . . Et habita bona et longa discussione . . . remansimus in concordio de omnibus capitulis, secundum quod alias concluderamus cum domino Cataneo . . ." (although some questions, which need not detain us here, did remain for settlement).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 135^v, "die ultimo Februarii."

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 136^v, dated 8 and 13 March, 1404.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, Reg. 1, fol. 137^r, dated 18 March: "Capta: Quod respondeatur et dicatur istis ambaxiatoribus magnifice comunitatis Janue qui fuerunt heri ad presentiam domini dicentes habuisse responsionem a domino gubernatore et a sua comunitate predicta per quam ipsi dant sibi plenum arbitrium et potestatem possendi firmare concordium inter nos tractatum et stipulare contractus necessarios iuxta formam capitulorum alias discussorum. . . ." There follows an outline of the terms of peace, which the Senate accepted *de parte* 104, *de non* 16, *non sinceri* 5.

¹⁰⁰ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxiv, pp. 142–56, from the Archivio di Stato di Genova, Materie Politiche, Mazzo 11/2730, and note the summary in Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. ix, no. 276, p. 295. The treaty was signed "die xxii Marcii, hora prima noctis," which would be between 8:00 and 9:00 p.m. (*cf.* the table in B. M. Lersch, *Einleitung in die Chronologie*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899, I, 9), not as stated by M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie* (1936), p. 272, "à 2 heures du matin"! The text was apparently published in Venice on 3 April, after

Venetian chronicler Morosini, however, adds that the Genoese, "as their custom always is," were most delinquent in keeping the promises their envoys had made.¹⁰¹

Marshal Boucicaut was furious, but he had been holding his fire for months. Shortly after the battle of Modon, the Doge Michele Steno had written Charles VI of France (on 30 October, 1403), accusing Boucicaut of treacherous and wholly unwarranted aggression.¹⁰² It is not clear when the marshal first received a copy of this letter, but once he was assured of the release of the French and Genoese prisoners being held in Venice, he did not let the doge's rehearsal of the facts go unchallenged. On 6 June, 1404, he sent a public letter to the doge and Carlo Zeno. The author of the *Livre des faits* has preserved the French text, of which Giorgio Stella has incorporated in his chronicle a shortened, Latin version. Boucicaut disputes the allegations in Steno's letter "pour ce qu'elles sont toutes fondées sur menconges sans y

avoir mis nul mot de verité!" They were lies from beginning to end.

Boucicaut charged that when contrary winds prevented his access to Alexandria, where for good and just reasons he planned to attack the soldan's subjects, and he then turned toward Syria, he found the Moslems "bien avisez de la venue de moy et de mon armée." The Venetians had warned them to expect him, "which was contrary to God, honesty, and everything a good Christian should do." He justified his attack upon Beirut "as being in the land of the enemy." No Venetian had come forward at the time, he said, to claim the paltry merchandise his men had seized, as the doge falsely stated in his letter to the king. If it had been identified as Venetian property, he would have restored it. He marveled at the Venetians, for they were certainly the greatest liars on earth. He could have seized Venetian ships at Candeloro, Famagusta, and Rhodes as well as along the Syrian coast, but he had not molested them, "for everywhere I found them, I dealt with them as well as, or better than, if they had been Genoese ships."

As for the battle itself, Boucicaut denied that when his eleven galleys had arrived at Modon on 7 October (1403), Zeno and the Venetian fleet had come out to show themselves "amiablement à moy et à mes galées," merely seeking some guarantee of satisfaction for the Venetian losses at Beirut. He denied strenuously that he had been the first to manifest hostility. He was not responsible for the "dure bataille entre les parties," in which three of his galleys had been captured, and the others allegedly put to flight. He had anchored off the island of Sapienza on Saturday, 6 October, "cuidans estre en lieu d' amis." So little did he plan to attack Zeno, and so little did he expect Zeno to attack him, Boucicaut says, that a few days before his arrival at Sapienza, he had sent back two galleys to Chios, a galley and a galiot to Mytilene, a galley and a galiot to Pera, and a galley to Aenos. He had also dispatched another galley to Alexandria, and dismissed another two or three galiots. If his intentions had been anything but peaceable, he would have retained these large reinforcements, for they were his to command.

The day before he reached Sapienza, two of the ships (with sick and wounded, whom he had sent ahead from Rhodes) met up with him, while he was still at Cape S. Angelo. One of them carried some 800 armed men, according to Boucicaut, whom he might have taken

its acceptance in Genoa (Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 114, 116, 118, 120, and Sanudo, *Vite de' duchi*, in *RISS*, XXII, cols. 805E–806A, both accounts being somewhat inaccurate). Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, ad ann. 1404, in *RISS*, XVII, col. 1202E, says that the peace was published in Genoa on 4 April, and cf. the "Cronachetta veneziana," in *Archivio veneto*, XVII (IX, 1879), 306.

¹⁰¹ Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 116: "Le qual chose fo mal hotegnude per loro, chomo senpre hē la soa huxanza!" Cf., *ibid.*, I, 164, 166.

¹⁰² The Senate approved the letter to be sent in the doge's name on 30 October, 1403. After emphasizing the ever peaceful intentions of Venice and relating Boucicaut's attack upon Beirut, the letter states: "Accidit quod ipse [dominus Buciquardus] et galee Ianuensium numero XI se reperierunt modo nuper circa diem VII mensis instantis in aquis nostris Mothoni euntes in formam hostium, prout apparuit per effectum, capitaneus autem noster predictus [Karolus Geno] existens in partibus illis deliberavit se ostendere amicabilem domino Buciquardo et galeis Ianuensium suprascriptis pro conquerendo se caritative de dannis illatis [in partibus Baruti] per ipsos nostratibus et pro requiringo satisfactionem . . . sperando ipsum reperire in illa benivolentia et amore quo eosdem reperit quando ad partes orientales accesserunt, et tunc capitaneus Ianuensium antedictus et galee sue contra nostras galeas proras vertentes se dederunt hostiliter contra nostros, quod capitaneus noster videns, non valens aliter facere, coactus tenuit modum similem contra illos in tantum quod prelium inter partes fuit dure commissum ob manifestam culpam . . . domini Bucciardi et galearum suarum, qui in accessu ad partes Orientis se amicum ostendit, in reditu vero hostis morem servavit, in quo prelio sic deliberante Altissimo, qui fovesit iusticiam non relinquit, tres ex galeis Ianuensium capte fuerunt a nostris, relique vero se fuge dederunt . . ." (Misti, Reg. 46, fol. 111^r). On 2 November a similar letter was written, *mutatis mutandis*, to Philippe de Mézières, *consiliarius regius*, who still wielded much influence from his conventual retreat in Paris, and who was well known to be a friend of Venice.

aboard his galleys for combat. He had not done so. Furthermore, at Cape S. Angelo just before daybreak, his galleys had suddenly found in their midst a Venetian brigantine, "which was bringing several letters to you, Carlo Zeno, and to those of your company." When the bearer came aboard Boucicaut's flagship, the letters were turned over to the skipper, who asked what was to be done with them, "to which I replied that I wanted him to return them unopened." That same night Boucicaut learned from a Venetian ship in the area that Carlo Zeno was at Porto Longo with eleven galleys, and that there were two Venetian merchantmen (*grosses galées*) in the harbor at Modon as well as several other ships (*navires*) in the area. He saw nothing sinister, however, in this concentration of naval forces.

Early Sunday morning, 7 October, Boucicaut set out from Sapienza to go to Zonklon "pour m'en venir mon chemin devers Jannes:" "And so when I had gone about two or three miles, heading straight for the said port of Zonklon to take on water . . . , you [suddenly] showed yourself, Carlo Zeno, with eleven galleys, having left Porto Longo to go toward Modon, of which I had no suspicion." Mistaking certain tactical moves on Zeno's part as a desire to enter into communication with him, Boucicaut had quickly discovered Zeno's "trahison et mauvaistié." The Venetian fleet, consisting now of thirteen galleys (with the two *grosses galées*), was advancing in battle formation upon Boucicaut's poorly armed eleven galleys. The Venetians were armed to their very teeth. Carlo Zeno's galley had slipped in between the two heavy merchant galleys, "for your greater security, Carlo Zeno!" Seven or eight brigantines hove into sight. They were also loaded with men-at-arms and archers.

Zeno's whole performance had hardly suggested an approach to ask for the restitution of the Venetian goods seized at Beirut, as the doge had stated in his letter to Charles VI. Venetian horse and foot had appeared along the shore between Modon and Zonklon. Zeno had overlooked nothing. Boucicaut turned the prows of his galleys to face Zeno's oncoming fleet, but ordered his men to refrain from attack until he himself gave the order. The extent of Zeno's preparations revealed "la volonté traytreuse de lonc temps [que] aviés en vostre courage," but of course the Senate had directed Zeno not to attack unless he did have a marked advantage over Boucicaut. The latter claimed to have given the command to

attack at the last possible moment to prevent encirclement. Accusing Zeno of treachery as well as of mendacity, Boucicaut admitted withal that the Venetians had captured three of his Genoese galleys although he asserted that he had taken one of Zeno's galleys. But the Venetians had three times the Genoese manpower, always according to Boucicaut, and almost double the number of warships. Since the Genoese were thus taken by surprise and were so ill equipped, it would have been small wonder if the Venetians had taken all Boucicaut's galleys. Clearly, God did not allow Venetian treachery to work its will.

As for the "flight" of the Genoese galleys from the scene, Boucicaut charged Zeno with being as big a liar as he was a coward. Every witness to the battle knew that it was Zeno who had first withdrawn, retreating into the harbor of Modon. Boucicaut and the Genoese had stood their ground, so to speak, until the Venetians had disappeared from sight. If Michele Steno, the doge, had commanded or countenanced this dastardly attack upon the Genoese, considering "la bonne paix" which he had with them, he had acted "comme faulx traytre et mauvais." Regarding the whole affair as touching his honor as a knight, and once more castigating Michele Steno for the "faulces et mauvaises menconges" in his letter to Charles VI, Boucicaut challenged both the doge and Zeno to combat. They might come into the field, if they dared to come, by themselves or with companions, of whom he would allow them more than he would bring into combat. If Steno and Zeno replied, however, that they were more practiced "par mer que par terre," he was ready to meet a galley full of Venetian men-at-arms with a galley of French and Genoese combatants. In the meantime he awaited their answer.¹⁰³ The Genoese chroniclers say that he never received one.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ *Livre des faits*, ed. Buchon, III, pt. II, chap. xxxi, pp. 641-46, and eds. Michaud and Poujoulat, II, pt. II, chap. cited, pp. 285-90. Boucicaut's letter is also reprinted in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxv, pp. 157-66, who misdates it 7 June. The account of the battle of Modon, as given in the *Livre des faits*, pt. II, chaps. xxvi-xxvii, is naturally in general accord with the contents of the letter, of which there is a paraphrase in Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, ad ann. 1404, in *RISS*, XVII, cols. 1203-4, and also in Uberto Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, bk. IX, trans. Francesco Serdonati, Genoa, 1597, pp. 392-93.

¹⁰⁴ Stella, *Ann. genuenses*, in *RISS*, XVII, col. 1204D; Foglietta, *Dell' Istorie di Genova*, bk. IX, p. 393. Boucicaut's challenge apparently made some impression in Venice, where it was known to the anonymous author of the "Cronachetta veneziana," in *Archivio veneto*, XVII (IX, 1879), 308-9.

Boucicaut's letter was doubtless embarrassing to the doge as well as to Zeno, but the Venetians had more to think about than the irate marshal's vainglorious blast. These years marked a turning point in Venetian history. After the unexpected death of Gian Galeazzo Visconti (in September, 1402), the Carraresi of Padua destroyed themselves by their unwise and overweening ambition. Colliding with Venice for the last time, they fell before the superior power of the Republic, which was expanding with startling success on *terra ferma* and even on the eastern coast of the Adriatic. Venetian forces occupied Vicenza, Bassano, Belluno, Feltre, and Cividale (in 1404), as well as Padua and Verona, Dulcigno, Budua, and Antivari (in 1405).¹⁰⁵ Although Boucicaut preserved the full measure of his hostility to Venice, on 13 July, 1405, he was ordered by four envoys whom Charles VI had sent to Genoa to cease from "all offenses" against the Venetians until the following 1 March, during which period negotiations would be carried on to revise and put into effect the treaty of 22 March, 1404.¹⁰⁶

Boucicaut took no part in the discussions that went on from month to month for an entire year. Finally, on 11 June, 1406, at the request of Pope Benedict XIII, he left Genoa to go to Savona, appointing Gilbert de la Fayette as his lieutenant. A week later procurators were chosen in the Palazzo del Comune in Genoa to arrange with the Venetian envoy (and later doge) Tommaso Mocenigo a *reformatio pacis* and a *syncerum accordium* that was intended to last in perpetuity.¹⁰⁷ On 28 June (1406) Mocenigo and the Genoese procurators accepted the new treaty with mutual pledges of adherence to the twenty-five articles it contained. They reaffirmed both the peace of Turin (1381) and the accord of 1404, with many additions and detailed modifications. After a preamble, the text began with a general "remission" of past offenses and injuries, and provided for the

restitution of or compensation for the ships and merchandise which each side had seized from the other during the period of hostilities. The Genoese agreed to pay 8,000 Cypriote bezants or the equivalent sum of 1,500 gold florins for the much-publicized Venetian losses at Beirut. Many individual claims were involved; some of them were difficult to assess; and final adjudication had to be left to subsequent arbitration. Increasingly disenchanted with their royal governor, the Genoese actually held themselves responsible (under pressure from Mocenigo) for any actions that Boucicaut, *donec erit in officio gubernacionis*, might take against Venice, provided he employed Genoese ships or subjects or foreigners (*forenses*) in Genoese possessions. Violation of the new treaty by either side carried with it a penalty of 20,000 florins.¹⁰⁸

When pressed to meet their obligations, the Genoese dragged their heels. The board of arbitration was to consist of five members, two Genoese, two Venetians, and one more person or state. The Florentine government refused to serve as the fifth (and obviously important) arbitrator, and on 8 June, 1407, the choice fell on young Amadeo VIII of Savoy, who thus assumed the role his grandfather had played so successfully at Turin twenty-six years before. After the usual delays, Amadeo held eighteen meetings with the representatives of Venice and Genoa from 31 March to 2 August, 1408. A week later (on 9 August) he pronounced his arbitral judgment at Chambéry.¹⁰⁹ The Venetians had pressed to the last ducat their claims for lost ships and merchandise amounting to tens of thousands of ducats. Amadeo apparently pared a good deal of fat off their demands, but the Genoese remained dissatisfied. They protested his decision; nevertheless, Amadeo neither withdrew nor modified it. He held the Genoese responsible for damages amounting to slightly over 100,000 ducats. The Venetians demanded payment.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ Cf. H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. v. Venedig*, II (1920, repr. 1964), 251–61, with notes on the sources, *ibid.*, pp. 612–14.

¹⁰⁶ Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxvi, pp. 167–69; M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie* (1936), pp. 279–80.

¹⁰⁷ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. x, nos. 17–18, pp. 313–14; Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxvii–1, pp. 170–73, dated 18 June, 1406. The Venetian notary Francesco Bevazano had been sent to Genoa to arrange the preliminaries; his commission is apparently dated in January, 1405 (Ven. style 1404), and may be found in the *Misti*, Reg. 46, fols. 163^v–164^v, where the heading of fol. 163^v is misdated December, 1405.

¹⁰⁸ Delaville Le Roulx, I, 491–97, has analyzed the treaty of 28 June, 1406, and published the text, *ibid.*, II, no. xxxvii–2, pp. 173–95. It is also summarized by Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. x, no. 19, pp. 314–15, who gives the penalty as 25,000 florins, and note also nos. 20–27, 29. The treaty was published in Venice on 25 July.

¹⁰⁹ Delaville Le Roulx, I, 498–502, and II, no. xxxviii, pp. 200–17.

¹¹⁰ Amadeo's judgment, as given in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xxxviii, pp. 200–17, seems to hold the Genoese responsible for the payment of 101,367 ducats to Venice.

Genoa sent one Ingo de' Grimaldi to Venice to remonstrate and reopen the negotiations. The Senate heard Grimaldi courteously, but stood firm on the Savoyard judgment, and declined to resubmit the whole question of reparations to a new arbiter who should be chosen by mutual agreement. Too much time and expense had already gone into those perennial discussions, the Senate said, which had been held in Venice and Genoa, Florence and finally Savoy. One could not so lightly set aside the verdict of Count Amadeo. It would be an intolerable affront to him; he had undertaken the arduous task of helping them; and justice had certainly been done to both parties. In a letter of 15 June, 1409 (received in Venice on 1 July) the Genoese stated that, after receiving Grimaldi's report of the failure of his mission, they wished to submit their differences with Venice to the council then assembled at Pisa. The Genoese were quite aware that Venice had not yet recognized the legitimacy of the Council of Pisa, which on 5 June (1409) had deposed the Avignonese pontiff Benedict XIII, who had just held his own council at Perpignan, as well as his Roman rival Gregory XII, who was then holding a "council" at Cividale in Friuli.¹¹¹

The Venetian reply on 9 July (1409) to the Genoese letter of 15 June is one of the more succinct and interesting of the many documents to be found in the Venetian *Senatus Secreta* relating to this years-long dispute between the two maritime states. The Genoese had suggested that the new pope, to be elected at Pisa, could decide on the indemnities to be paid—as a consequence of Boucicaut's seizure of the goods and galleys sailing under the protection of S. Mark. By the time of the Venetian reply the new pope had already been elected (on 26 June); he was Pietro Filargo of Candia, who assumed the name Alexander V. And incidentally, although as a native of Crete Alexander had been a Venetian subject, it was to take the Senate two months and more than fifty ballots (on 21 August, 1409) to recognize

the validity of his election and the deposition of Gregory XII, who was also a Venetian.¹¹²

The Venetians would not accept the papal adjudication of their claims against Genoa. Amadeo had rendered a just decision. In fact he had greatly favored the Genoese, they declared, for he had trimmed a large part from the sums properly due Venice for the losses the Genoese had caused Venetian shipping. Indeed, if the Genoese had any regard for their honor and reputation, they would pay promptly without such appeals to the council. They would abide by the well-known terms of the peace of Turin, and meet their obligations in this highly important matter "sine ulterioribus protractionibus."¹¹³

¹¹² Sen. Secreta, Reg. 4, fols. 48^r–50^r, esp. fol. 49^r, dated 18–21 August, 1409, and see the account in Antonio Morosini, *Chronique*, eds. Lefèvre-Pontalis and Dorez, I (1898), 260–68, who mistakenly places the deciding vote on 22 August. Note also Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme*, IV, 112–13.

¹¹³ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 4, fol. 38^r, dated 9 July, 1409: "Quod scribatur in hac forma regimini Janue et consilio: Illustris et magnifice frater ac venerabiles amici karissimi, litteras vestras datas Janue xv mensis Junii proxime elapsi primo mensis instantis recepimus effectualiter continentes qualiter sapiens legum doctor dominus Inghus de Grimaldis, quem in vestrum oratorem ad nostram presentiam transmisistis pro facto sententie contra comunitatem vestram in nostrum favorem per illustrem dominum comitem Sabaudie cum multa deliberatione et maturitate late, retulit vestre magnifice fraternitati se nos requisivisse quod vellemus nos summittere cognitioni novi iudicis comuni assensu eligendi et quod istud a nobis obtinere non valuit licet ut scribitis talis modus vobis videretur partium utrique saluber et iuri utriusque partis expediens. Nobis autem nequaquam apparuit rem decisam cum tot litium anfractibus et tanto temporis cursu et tot tractatibus habitis et hic et Janue et Florentie et tandem in Sabaudia velle in dubium revocare cum istud aperte videamus nec dubitemus quin etiam vos manifeste cognoscatis non posse fieri sine diminutione honoris dicti illustris domini comitis Sabaudie qui contemplatione vestra et nostra non recusavit arduum laboris in decidendo premissam litem.

"Cum etiam non putemus amplius posse manifestari iura utriusque partis quam manifestata sint ex premissis tractatibus habitis ut supra, verum quia subiungitis quod propter relationem dicti domini Inghi deliberastis super appellatione et aliis remediis interpositis per syndicos et ambaxiatores vestros a sententia prefata ius vestrum velle prosequi coram concilio Pisis congregato et deinde coram summo pontifice ibi eligendo et declaratione predicte sententie pro posse obtinere nisi forte eligeremus que ipse dominus Inghus nobis obtulit parte vestra circa modum prosequendi appellationem, respondemus quod vestra magnifica fraternitas debet esse certissima quod, sicut scribitis vos habuisse consilia iuristarum, ita etiam nos volumus habere sanum et deliberatum consilium famosorum et peritissimorum iuristarum et non unius tantum sed diversorum et singulariter et collegialiter ut haberemus quid sentirent in facto asserte appellationis vestre predicte

Antonio Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 244, gives the amount as 95,765 ducats; cf. M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie* (1936), pp. 339–40.

¹¹¹ On the Council of Pisa, see Noël Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, IV (Paris, 1902, repr. Hildesheim, 1967), chaps. I and II, and esp. pp. 57, 98–104, 112–14 in the present connection.

Marshal Boucicaut was undoubtedly an obstacle to the settlement of the Venetian claims, but his days as governor of Genoa were numbered. Leaving the city with more than 5,000 horse and almost 1,000 foot (on 31 July, 1409), Boucicaut set out for Milan at the invitation of Gianmaria Visconti, the unstable young duke, son of the late Gian Galeazzo. For a brief while it looked as though the French were going to add a protectorate over Milan to their domination over Genoa. Gianmaria needed protection against his predatory neighbors; he was also at odds with his younger brother Filippo Maria, count of Pavia, who later succeeded him in the duchy (in June, 1412). Northern Italy was in a turmoil, and Boucicaut's enemies were at work. On the evening of 6 September the marquis of Montferrat, Theodore II Palaeologus, a distant relative of the Byzantine emperor, entered Genoa in force. He had the support of the powerful condottiere Facino Cane, lord of Alessandria, soon to become governor of Milan (1410–1412). The allies had some 4,000 horse and 2,500 foot under their command. As Theodore took up residence in the Dominican convent, Facino Cane set out to prevent Boucicaut's return; Theodore was promptly elected captain of the city, says Stella, "with the authority and the revenues which the doges of Genoa used to have." Despite prolonged effort and some success in the field, Boucicaut was unable to retake the city. His governorship was at an end, and so was French dominion in Liguria. The marshal was recalled to France in the fall of 1410, and was in Paris by the following February. He served as captain-general of Languedoc (in 1413–1415), was captured by the English at Agincourt, and died

a prisoner in Yorkshire in 1421.¹¹⁴ Crusader and warrior, loyal servitor of the crown, connoisseur of fine books and belles-lettres, Boucicaut has long been a favorite of the French historians of chivalry.

Venice reacted cautiously to Boucicaut's expulsion from Genoa. On 29 December (1409) the Senate rejected the proposed draft of a letter to Theodore Palaeologus of Montferrat in answer to notification from him (dated 12 November) of his "assumption" to the captaincy of Genoa *de communi assensu civium*. According to the draft of this letter—whose sponsors, in submitting it to the Senate, wanted to congratulate Theodore and the Genoese on the fortunate change of government—Theodore's own letter of 12 November had not been received in Venice until 23 December. And this was, they stated in the letter, the first official word the Senate had had from Theodore in this connection. It is impossible to say whether this was really the case or whether the Venetians were trying to excuse an unseemly delay in responding to Theodore's message. A majority of the Senate decided, however, that an outright approval of the Monferratine coup d'état would never do, for Genoa had been a French protectorate, and Charles VI would not put up with such an affront to his royal dignity. It would be *securius et utilius* to send some notary as an envoy to Genoa to deliver an oral message expressing Venetian satisfaction in the removal of Boucicaut and the French from Genoa. Sometimes the wrong people were given access to letters, and the written word could always return to embarrass the writer. Furthermore, it would be a good thing to keep a notary resident in Genoa to report from time to time on developments in the city.¹¹⁵ As the docu-

qui in una opinione convenientes inspecto capitulo pacis celebrate Taurini ac libertate per partes data dicto illustri domino comiti Sabaudie inspectisque omnibus aliis scripturis ad rem spectantibus absque dubio constanter affirmant quod ipsa sententia lata fuit secundum veram iustitiam et equitatem et cum bono, maturo et gravi consilio et in magnum favorem vestrum et cum diminutione magne partis illarum quantitatum pecunie quas iuste a vobis pro dannis per vos nostris illatis habere debebamus, quas quantitates iam etiam debuissetis soluisse pro conservatione honoris et fame vestre vestrique debiti satisfactione qualibet appellatione seu reclamacione atque mora semotis, que siquidem appellatio seu reclamatio locum habere non potuit nec potest, sed per vos vestramque comunitatem debet premissa sententia executioni plene et integraliter mandari in omnibus et per omnia secundum continentiam capituli dicte pacis. . . ."

¹¹⁴ On Boucicaut's loss of Genoa in early September, 1409, see Giorgio Stella, *Annales genuenses*, ad ann. 1409, in *RİSS*, XVII, cols. 1220E–1226; *Religieux de Saint-Denys*, ed. M. L. Bellaguet, IV (Paris, 1842), 254–66, 404, 406; Antonio Morosini, *Chronique*, I, 270–304, 308–11, with Lefèvre-Pontalis's notes; M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des guerres d'Italie* (1936), pp. 377–85; cf. Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme*, IV, 131–32. There is a brief sketch of Boucicaut's life by Louis Bréhier, in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, IX (1937), cols. 1473–87.

¹¹⁵ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 4, fol. 83, dated 29 December, 1409: "Quia considerato quod civitas Janue regebatur et gubernabatur sub regimine et protectione domini regis Francie, sicut omnibus est manifestum, et considerato modo et ordine quibus extracta est de manibus suis, presumendum est quod dictus dominus rex Francie non debeat istam

ments show, Francesco Bevazano was chosen for the task. He had already served the Senate in Genoa, and knew both the place and its people.

The Senate believed such caution was advisable. Although Charles VI's mental derangement showed no signs of improving, he had just become reconciled with John the Fearless (in March, 1409), who was forgiven the murder of Louis d'Orléans (in November, 1407). Indeed, John seemed to be heading a reform movement in Paris, and it was not yet clear that France was again descending into the chaos from which Charles V had rescued her. Facing the possibility of having to defend themselves against the French, the Genoese wanted to solve their Venetian problem. Theodore of Montferrat and the officials of S. George informed Francesco Bevazano, the Venetian notarial envoy in Genoa, that they wished to do what was "just and right," as the envoy wrote his government; he also stated that, if he had the authority to negotiate, it might well be that he could bring the whole affair to a satisfactory conclusion. The Venetians were also anxious for the restoration of friendly relations with Genoa, but the Senate saw no need of "negotiations" (*praticha*) except to arrange the terms of payment for the full amount provided for in Amadeo VIII's judgment (*sententia*). Convenient and reasonable terms could easily be arranged.¹¹⁶ The Venetians remained adamant, however, against even the slightest reduction in the Genoese debt, for which they expected payment through the Officio di S. Giorgio.

Public finance was always a problem in Genoa. Boucicaut's high-handedness had also caused a revolt of the Genoese shareholders (the *mahonesi*) of Chios, who sent an envoy to the Venetian Senate to request a loan of 20,000 ducats, trading concessions, and licenses to purchase and export arms from Venice as well

as food from Candia and Negroponte. On 12 May, 1409, the Senate declined to make the loan, but allowed the purchase and export of arrows, shields, and catapults or "bombards" from Venice and of *victualia* from Candia and Negroponte, provided it caused no inconvenience to the state or hardship to Venetian citizens and subjects.¹¹⁷

The Genoese had doubtless found the Chian overtures to Venice worrisome, but the danger passed, and the question of the reparations due Venice dragged on for another year. About the beginning of June, 1410, the notary Francesco Bevazano wrote the Venetian Senate that the Genoese were now ready to pay "from 15,000 to 20,000 florins in three or four years and thereafter 1,000 ducats a year until the completion of payment of the entire balance." At that rate it would take more than eighty years to pay off the 100,000 ducats which Venice claimed in reparations. The Senate declined the offer on 24 June

in consideration of the large sum of money for which they are our debtors according to the said decision [of Amadeo VIII] and of how much larger are the damages [than stated in the decision] suffered by our citizens and subjects, who honestly placed a just value on their losses and no more, and of how many years have elapsed since the period of the losses, . . . and of how many more will pass before they receive full payment!

Venice was, however, prepared to accept 8,000 ducats a year for five years and thereafter 5,000 ducats a year (for about twelve years) until the sum specified in Amadeo's decision had been paid in full. If Bevazano simply could not get better terms, he was authorized to agree to the receipt of 6,000 ducats a year for four years and thereafter 3,000 ducats a year (for about twenty-five years) until the specified amount had been paid in full. Bevazano was to be firm, *dicendo et asserendo quod hec est nostra finalis intentio*. Payments were to be made in ducats and not in florins.¹¹⁸

Two months later, in letters of 20 and 25 August (1410), Bevazano wrote his government again. This time the Genoese proposed the payment of 25,000 gold florins in five years, at the rate of 5,000 a year, and thereafter 2,000 a

iniuriam pati propter quod securius est et utilius pro nostro dominio facere responsionem dictis Januensibus [i. e., Theodoro marchioni Montisferati capitaneo pro magnifico comuni Janue ac venerabili consilio Ancianorum, *ibid.*, fol. 83^r] per nuntium nostrum oretenus quam per literas ut nonnumquam dicte nostre literae possint per aliquem videri et quod habendo nuntium nostrum in Janua poterimus de tempore in tempus de his que in dictis partibus sequuntur esse informati, vadit pars quod mitti debeat Januam unus noster notarius per quem fieri debeat responsio literae predictae [i. e., date Janue die duodecimo mensis Novembris] . . ." (fol. 83^r).

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Reg. 4, fol. 97^r, dated 6 March, 1410.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Reg. 4, fol. 12^r. The Chian revolt was suppressed in June, 1409 (P. P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese* . . . , I [Cambridge, 1958], 162–65).

¹¹⁸ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 4, fols. 120^r–121^r.

year until the entire debt was paid. The difference between what Genoa would pay and what Venice would agree to accept was being narrowed. On 9 September the Senate replied that an acceptable arrangement would be 6,250 ducats a year for four years and thereafter 3,000 ducats a year (for twenty-five years). And thus a settlement was finally reached, whereby the Genoese would pay some 25,000 ducats in four or five years and the balance in annual remittances of 2,000 or 3,000 ducats. The Senate also relaxed the demand to be paid in ducats, but if the Genoese insisted upon discharging their debt in florins, it must be in the florins of Florence.¹¹⁹

The Genoese were glad to bring the troublesome affair to an end. Venice seemed once more to be ascending the heights of power and prosperity that she had known in the first half of the thirteenth century. A hundred years later her success would produce the League of Cambrai; in the meantime she was a formidable opponent and a valuable ally. In the Levant the Ottoman Turks were a menace (despite their defeat at Ankara) such as neither of the two maritime states had had to face in the decades following the Fourth Crusade. The Byzantine empire was the most exposed to attack, of course, but for some time after Ankara the internecine strife among Bayazid's sons seemed to offer an opportunity which, the Emperor Manuel II believed, should not be neglected.

In December, 1409, a Byzantine envoy appeared in Venice, bringing an appeal from the emperor. Now was the time, he said, to reduce the *potentia Turchorum* and to free Constantinople and eastern Christendom from Turkish aggression. Manuel II was not strong enough to launch the first attack upon the Turks by himself. He needed the help of Venice. The envoy asked for a "subvention" of eight galleys. Manuel would add two more of his own, and with the ten galleys he would begin by blocking the Turks' hitherto easy passage "from Turkey into Greece." There was no doubt in Manuel's mind that, once such a beginning had been made, the other princes and states would also contribute their "auxilia et favores." Manuel would make the necessary overtures to them. If he did not receive help from Venice at this time, however, he would have no alternative, despite his reluctance, but to make peace with the Turks on the best terms he could.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Reg. 4, fol. 134.

On 10 January, 1410, the Senate approved the answer which the doge would give the envoy. Manuel was to be commended for trying by every means to protect his *sanctum imperium* and thereby also to achieve the *liberatio Christianitatis* from Turkish oppression. All Christians should respond to the needs of their eastern coreligionists. The Venetians had done so both in the past and, as Manuel was aware, in his own time; they had put their lives and property in the front line of defense against the Turks. But as his Majesty had himself declared, success depended upon enlisting the "concurrency in this business" of the other princes and powers. Venice and Byzantium could not go it alone. Manuel should first make sure of the participation in the enterprise of the *alii principes, domini, et comunia*. When they were ready to make their contribution to an offensive against the Turks,

we shall also be found ready and willing for our part to do what shall seem to us fitting and proper: meanwhile, until the intention of the said princes and lords is known, we are very sure that, considering his great wisdom, his Majesty will know how to get along and live with the said Turks and to look to the preservation of his honor and the freedom . . . of his sacred empire, just as he has done most prudently up to now, and we urge his Majesty [to continue] in this way.¹²⁰

For some years before and long after Venice's efforts to secure compensation for the losses which Boucicaut and the Genoese freebooters had caused her, the Senate was engaged in another financial dispute which produced serious international complications. We must revert briefly to the Republic's involvement in John of Nevers's ransom after Nicopolis and to King Sigismund's claim to the so-called Venetian *census* of 7,000 ducats a year, which he had assigned to the payment of the ransom. Froissart informs us that, while Nevers and the other French lords were still at Treviso (at the turn of the years 1397-1398), Sigismund had sent an embassy, possibly headed by John de Kanizsa, offering to help pay their ransom and other expenses. The disastrous campaign of Nicopolis had ruined the revenues of Hungary for that and the following year, but the ambassadors said that "le roy de Hon-

¹²⁰ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 4, fol. 87; cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, II, no. 1362, pp. 88-89, and Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 5, no. 3327, p. 97.

guerie . . . a sur la cité de Venise de revenue par an sept mille ducas." The king proposed to sell this "rente" back to Venice, and he would place the proceeds at the disposal of Nevers and his companions. When the tender was made to the Venetians, however, they reacted coldly, and requested two weeks to consider the matter, at the end of which time they are said to have given a strangely arrogant reply. Froissart claims to have learned of it from a participant in the discussions: if Sigismund was prepared to sell the whole kingdom of Hungary, the Venetians were prepared to buy it and would make prompt payment in full. As for such a trifle as 7,000 ducats a year, they had no means of assessing its value from the standpoint of either seller or buyer, "et convenoit que la chose demourast en cel état."¹²¹ It is quite conceivable that some Venetian jocosely made such a remark within the hearing of Froissart's informant. To have returned such an answer officially to Sigismund's ambassadors, however, would have been at marked variance with the saccharine courtesy of the Republic's usual diplomatic practice.

That the Venetians should decline to purchase a "rente" which they were probably planning to abrogate, is very likely. The whole business had complications of which Froissart was not aware. The Hungarian "rente" was, from time to time, to ruffle Venetian relations with Burgundy over a period of some twenty-five years. An exchange of letters between the Venetian Senate (dated 21 April, 1403) and Philip of Burgundy (dated at Paris on 8 August) led the Senate to send the notary Piero Gualfredini on an embassy to the Burgundian court. Piero's commission, containing his instructions, is dated 24 October. Philip had stated that the Venetians were obviously seeking excuses, *quesitis variis coloribus*, to avoid paying the annual *census*, which Dino Rapondi had purchased. It was of course incumbent upon Philip to make good Rapondi's losses from year to year, owing to the Venetians' failure to meet their alleged obligation.

Piero Gualfredini was to explain to Philip that the 7,000 ducats in question was a return to Louis the Great, when he was king of Hungary, for his renunciation of all the rights and the jurisdiction (*omnia jura et actiones*) which he claimed in certain ports and other

places in Dalmatia. As long as Louis and, after him, Sigismund were able to meet their obligations to Venice under the *conventiones et pacta* (negotiated at Turin in 1381), Venice had continued to make the annual payment of 7,000 ducats at the feast of S. Stephen in August. Philip should be quite aware of this, for Venice had paid the *census* in September, 1399—5,000 ducats had been deducted from Nevers's debt to the Signoria, and the other 2,000 had been disbursed as Sigismund had previously directed. Since that time, however, Sigismund had been unable "to hold the ports and places of Dalmatia free and open to us and to our ships." His whole kingdom was in disorder, *multipliciter laceratum et divisum*. Ladislas of Durazzo, king of Naples, had seized Dalmatia from him, and was ruling the coastland.

The king and kingdom of Hungary were under as much obligation to Venice to live up to their part of the "conventions and pacts" as Venice was to make the annual payment of 7,000 ducats. The Senate had already rejected Sigismund's own efforts to collect the unpaid *census*, giving his envoys the reasons here set forth.¹²² Furthermore, Venice had never made any commitment of any sort to Nevers. The Signoria had indeed tried to spare him inconvenience and discomfort by allowing him to leave Treviso *de consensu et beneplacito nostro*. He had promised to pay his debt to Venice within six months, "which money has not yet been paid to us." The envoy Gualfredini was now to request that Venice be repaid (15,000 ducats!). He was also to remind Philip of how often the Burgundians had been allowed use of state galleys without charge.

After his audience with the duke, the envoy was to call on Rapondi, whom he knew well, set him straight, and ask him to urge Philip to repay his son's debt to the Signoria, now correctly stated as 10,000 ducats. If the duke and Rapondi received his mission pleasantly, all well and good; otherwise the envoy was to write the Republic's consul in Bruges to warn Venetian merchants in Flanders to take precautions for their own security and that of their goods. The consul was also to make discreet inquiries in Bruges and Ghent to find out whether the

¹²¹ Froissart, XVI, 61–64. Delaville Le Roulx, I, 322, and cf. pp. 327–28, believes the story.

¹²² In January, March, and April (1403) the Senate had just refused to give ambassadors sent by Sigismund the 21,000 ducats he was claiming for three years' *census* (Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. DCXXXIV, DCXXXVII, DCXXXIX, pp. 473, 475–76, 477).

Flanders fleet might safely make its annual run when the time came.¹²³

Philip the Bold died in April, 1404, and Nevers, known as John the Fearless (*sans Peur*) after his defeat of the Liégeois in late September, 1408,¹²⁴ succeeded him as duke of Burgundy. John was an unpleasant character—"small and ugly, with a long nose, a wry mouth, and an undershot jaw, even more ambitious than Philip and therefore a bad administrator . . . , he was harsh, cynical, crafty, imperious, gloomy, and a kill-joy."¹²⁵ Through the years, nevertheless, he displayed some ability as a leader, and achieved wide popularity north of the Loire. It was he with whom Venice now had to deal on the question of the Hungarian *census*, which the Senate steadfastly refused to pay. In September, 1406, two Burgundian envoys, whom John had sent to the lagoon, stated in apparently menacing tones "that their lord, the lord duke, . . . would take every means at his disposal to get the payment and satisfaction which he demanded. . . ." Fearing for the disruption of their trade in the Low Countries, the Senate resolved on 6 November to write Dino Rapondi, whose importance at the Burgundian court seemed to be no less great under the new duke than it had been under his father. John had already granted the usual safe-conducts for the merchants of the Flanders fleet, with the customary guarantees of security for their persons, goods, and galleys. The Senate had fullest confidence, they informed Rapondi, that the lord duke would honor the safe-conducts. Nevertheless, at the behest of their merchants, the Senate wished Rapondi to procure from the duke another safe-conduct in which it should be expressly stated that, notwithstanding the difference which existed between his Excellency and Venice concerning the 7,000 ducats *pro regno Hungarie*, the merchants, merchantmen, and merchandise of the Republic should be free from all claims and seizure. A copy of this

salvus conductus universalis should be sent to Luca Falier, the Venetian consul in Bruges, who would pay all the legal and other fees as well as the expenses of couriers. A copy should also be sent to Venice. If the duke declined to issue the safe-conduct, *quod credere non possumus*, Rapondi was asked to notify the doge and commune immediately.¹²⁶

The letter for Rapondi was sent with a copy to the consul Falier in Bruges. He was instructed to dispatch it immediately by special messenger to Rapondi, whose whereabouts he would know. When Rapondi had got the Burgundian letters of universal safe-conduct, Falier was to secure further guarantees and a special safe-conduct *in plena forma* from the cities of Flanders, especially Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres, with full assurance of the safety of all Venetian galleys, ships, merchants, subjects, goods, and wares which might come into their territories. If it seemed appropriate to Falier, he might explain that the duke of Burgundy was unjustly demanding the Hungarian *census* from Venice. If he obtained the special safe-conduct, *bene quidem*; if not, he should provide for his own security. In the meantime he was to keep the Senate informed of developments from day to day.¹²⁷

Almost half a century was to pass before the Burgundians would again make serious plans for a crusade against the Ottoman Turks. In the meantime France fell into a nightmare of political division and armed destruction. One night in November, 1407, henchmen of John the Fearless had murdered his uncle and rival for power, Louis of Orléans, in an ambush in Paris on the Rue Vieille-du-Temple, west of the Bastille near the old wall of Philip Augustus. In the subsequent struggle of the Orléanist-Armagnac faction against the ambitions of Burgundy, marauding troops repeated the worst days of the *routiers* of the previous century. John himself was stabbed to death a dozen years later in the presence of the dauphin Charles [VII], on the bridge of Montereau in September, 1419. John's son Philip the Good inherited his vast possessions, and turned to the English as allies to avenge his father's death. It was the period of Agincourt (1415) and the Lancastrian usurpation of the French crown

¹²³ Misti, Reg. 46, fols. 109^r-110^v, given in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XVIII, pp. 59-67. The Senate also wrote to Charles VI, and Gualfredini was instructed to learn everything he could "de intentione domini regis" (*ibid.*, II, no. XXXI, pp. 127-28): The Venetian fleet had recently had the hostile encounter with Boucicaut at Modon, which added to the difficulties of Gualfredini's mission.

¹²⁴ *Religieux de Saint-Denis*, IV, 150 ff., 170-71.

¹²⁵ Édouard Perroy, *The Hundred Years War*, trans. W. B. Wells, New York, 1951, p. 226.

¹²⁶ Misti, Reg. 47, fol. 78, given in Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XIX, pp. 68-70.

¹²⁷ Misti, Reg. 47, fol. 78^v; Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. XIX, pp. 70-71.

(1420). There were years of civil war and war with England.

In 1423, however, the Anglo-Burgundian alliance was beginning to show the first signs of the breakdown which would come at the congress of Arras twelve years later. Philip the Good was looking everywhere for money. He sent an embassy to Venice, bringing up once more the question of the Hungarian *census* of 7,000 ducats a year, to which he renewed the Burgundian claim. On 26 July, 1424, the Senate answered his request. They recalled their long friendship with Philip's house, his father's sojourn *multo tempore* at Treviso, and the loan they had made him of 15,000 ducats, two thirds of which had never been repaid. Again they emphasized that they were not, and had never been, under any financial obligation to John the Fearless. Venetian payment of the *census* had stopped when the king of Hungary could no longer maintain his own commitments to the Republic. Stretching a point or two, they rehearsed the provisions of the treaty of Zara of 18 February, 1358, by which they had in fact lost the Dalmatian coast, as well as those of the well-known treaty of Turin of 8 August, 1381, under which they had agreed to the annual grant of 7,000 ducats in return for free access to the Dalmatian ports (which Hungary had acquired in 1358). They had done this, they said, so that the king of Hungary would abandon his claim to reciprocity—which the troublesome lord of Padua, Francesco da Carrara, had maliciously urged on him—"to enter our ports and rivers, and to go by the latter straightway to Padua and other places, which we should not have tolerated, for it would have been to our great loss."

After this, however, as the Senate explained to the Burgundian ambassadors, King Ladislas of Naples was called by the Hungarian barons and prelates to Zara, where he was crowned king of Hungary (on 5 August, 1403) by John de Kanizsa, the archbishop of Gran, in the presence of the papal legate, Cardinal Angelo Acciajuoli. As trade along the coast was then being ruined by piracy, "we purchased from the said lord King Ladislas, true ruler of Dalmatia, the whole of Dalmatia for 100,000 ducats, and besides this we went to great expense in acquiring some lands which had rebelled against . . . King Ladislas, so that it can neither be said nor [even] suggested that the . . . king, kingdom, and crown of Hun-

gary had kept the promises made to us."¹²⁸ The Venetians had, therefore, no intention at this late date (1424) of paying the son the annuity of 7,000 ducats which they had refused the father a quarter of a century earlier.

Venice had indeed purchased the Dalmatian coast, or a part of it, in an act of notable importance. Representatives of the Republic had met with those of Ladislas in the church of S. Silvestro by the Grand Canal on 9 July, 1409. Since there had been previous negotiations, they could now quickly reach an agreement whereby the king ceded to the Venetians absolute possession of the entire Zara (Zadar) archipelago, including the historic city on its little walled peninsula, the fortress, the surrounding villages, and the 200 islands off shore. The cession specifically mentions the large island of Pag, famous from antiquity for its saltpans, and the town of Novigrad with its huge thirteenth-century castle. Venice obtained in fact the "royal rights" over all Dalmatia, which with the areas she soon set about acquiring, gave her an effective control over the coast in about a dozen years. The price was, as the Senate informed Philip the Good, 100,000 ducats; 40,000 were to be paid within forty days of the Venetians' taking possession, and 30,000 in each of the two following years. Both the doge and king promised to give neither aid nor favor to enemies of the other for a period of ten years.¹²⁹

The battle of Nicopolis had weakened Sigismund's position in Hungary, and frightened the Zaratini, who preferred the lion banner to the Turkish crescent. Nicopolis had also extinguished French enthusiasm for the crusade; furthermore, factional strife in France and the Low Countries made any thought of an anti-Ottoman expedition futile in the extreme. Sigismund, who had been recognized as king of the Romans from July, 1411, naturally tried to prevent the Venetians from taking over the Dalmatian coast. He invaded Friuli. All the successes he enjoyed, however, in the first

¹²⁸ Sen. Secreta, Reg. 8, fols. 165^v-166; Delaville Le Roulx, II, no. xx, pp. 72-74. From December, 1401, to the very day of his coronation, when he wrote the Doge Michele Steno of Venice, the documents reveal Ladislas's progress toward possession of Dalmatia (Ljubić, *Listine*, in *MHSM*, IV, nos. DCIX-DCXLI, pp. 442 ff.).

¹²⁹ Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III, bk. x, nos. 87-93, 99, pp. 340-43, esp. no. 88. Everyone in Venice knew the cost of the Zadar archipelago ("Cronachetta veneziana," in *Archivio veneto*, XVII [IX, 1879], 317).

phase of the war (1409–1413) were undone when hostilities were resumed (1418–1420). With an extraordinary burst of martial energy the Venetians ended up with most of Friuli. As for Dalmatia, Cherso (Cres), the second largest island in the Adriatic, had been part of the Venetian purchase of 1409, after which the Republic had acquired Arbe (Rab) in 1410 and the coastal city of Sebenico (Šibenik) in 1412. Early in the year 1420 the friendly citizens of Cattaro (Kotor) offered voluntarily to submit to Venice, their third offer in fact, and this time the Republic accepted it with the assurance that the Cattaresi would never again fall under Hungarian domination. The Venetian fleet was mobilized at Sebenico in April (1420) under Piero Loredan, the captain-general of the “Gulf” (the Adriatic). He took Traù (Trogir) on 27 June and Spalato (Split) a day later. Venice was riding the crest of a wave of conquest; success came even more easily in Dalmatia than in Friuli. Traù had been the center of resistance, and its surrender soon brought the capitulation of the islands of Brazza (Brač), Lesina (Hvar), and Curzola (Korčula). Within less than two years (by April, 1422) there were Venetian garrisons in the Albanian cities of Budua, Antivari, Dulcigno, and Alessio. Scutari and Durazzo had already been acquired. These are the *anni mirabiles* of Venetian history. Veglia (Krk), the largest island in the Adriatic, still remained, to be sure, under the rule of the Frangipane (Frankopan) family, which also held Segna (Senj) on the mainland, but Veglia was finally surrendered to Venice in 1480. Ragusa (Dubrovnik) preserved her independence.¹³⁰

The Dalmatian coast was a rich possession, and the Venetians drew therefrom olives, wine, fish, grain, meat, vegetables, figs, timber, and building stone. Many a Venetian palace still rests on piles of Dalmatian oak. The loss of the

coast under the terms of the treaty of Zara (Zadar) on 18 February, 1358, had been a severe blow to Venice. The Croats had rejoiced in their semi-independence under the Hungarian crown. The treaty had been signed in the sacristy of the Franciscan church in Zara. Six centuries later (on 18 February, 1958) a plaque was put up on the wall of the sacristy, to the left of the doorway from the choir, commemorating the treaty and still rejoicing in the fact that the doge of Venice had had to give up the ducal titles to Dalmatia and Croatia. Now he could resume them, and it was just as well, for in 1417 the Turks had occupied Avlona,¹³¹ just across from Brindisi and Otranto at the narrow entrance to the Adriatic.

If the natural resources of her new possessions were useful to Venice, where the food supply was often a problem, these places were even more of a boon to shipping. Venetian ships and galleys went up and down the Adriatic coast, never out of sight of land as they threaded their way through the “thousand islands,” *eundo per ripariam de loco ad locum*. The Christian defeat at Nicopolis had helped eliminate the French from participation in the crusade. In some ways Nicopolis also lay behind the Venetian recovery of Dalmatia and the Albanian coast. The Turks were rapidly recovering, however, both from their defeat at Ankara and from the war of the Ottoman succession. The center of their state had shifted from Bursa in Asia Minor to Adrianople in Europe. Venice would be called upon increasingly, in the years to come, to help stem the westward flow of the Ottoman tide.

¹³⁰ H. Kretschmayr, *Gesch. v. Venedig*, II (1920, repr. 1964), 261–70, and Roberto Cessi, *La Repubblica di Venezia e il problema adriatico*, Naples, 1953, pp. 110–31, 142–58.

¹³¹ Avlona was taken by the Turks in June, 1417, in which connection note the resolution of the Venetian Senate dated 19 July, in the *Misti*, Reg. 52, fol. 36v: “Quod scribatur baiulo et capitaneo Corphoi et consiliariis in hac forma, videlicet: Recepimus litteras vestras datas xxvii et xxviii Junii preteriti per quas vidimus omnia que secuta sunt de magnifica domina Avalone et statu suo qui pervenit ad manus Teucrorum ac de provisione per vos facta in armando galeotam nostram ibi existentem pro conservatione insule et fidelium nostrorum per illa maria navigantium . . .,” and see, *ibid.*, fols. 97v–98r.

16. THE ATHENIAN CHURCH AND LORDSHIP UNDER THE BURGUNDIANS (1204–1308)

BEFORE the winter of 1204 had begun Othon, sire de la Roche, was installed in his new Athenian barony. Various details are known of his family history. His grandfather, for example, the lord of la Roche-sur-Ognon (Doubs), is named in a donation made to the Church of Besançon by Étienne, count of Burgundy, in 1170, when the latter was preparing to depart for the Holy Land. Othon's father, Ponce de la Roche, appears as a witness to several donations and feudal accords made in the 1180's and 1190's. Obviously our concern with the de la Roche need begin only with Othon's participation in the Fourth Crusade and his establishment in Athens and Thebes, but it is not irrelevant to note that he was a member of a house distinguished in the annals of Burgundy from the eleventh century to the seventeenth.¹

The prestige of Othon de la Roche was high in the crusading host. He was present at the siege of Constantinople in July, 1203, among the "gens de Borgoigne,"² who distinguished themselves in one of the first incidents in the crusaders' attack upon the city,³ and he later helped to negotiate the final details of the marriage alliance which joined Boniface of Montferrat's daughter Agnes to the new Emperor Henry, brother of the late Baldwin, which appeared for a time to reconcile the enmity, so detrimental to the future of the Latins in Greece, between the house of Montferrat and that of Flanders.⁴

Thebes was certainly taken over by the Latin followers of Boniface of Montferrat without any opposition, as we have seen from the testimony of Nicetas Choniates, and the same was probably true of Athens, although there was a Venetian tradition to the effect that, after the Venetian occupation of Modon and Coron, "the Achaeans and Athenians, through their messengers, submitted themselves to the Venetians, but although the latter were disposed to take over [their] cities, they were prevented, not without the shedding of blood, by the men of Champagne, over whom the lord de la Roche had command."⁵ Be this as it may, the opposition certainly did not come from the Athenians.

We need not dwell on how the Fleming Jacques d'Avesnes occupied the island of Negroponte (Euboea), and Boniface of Montferrat and Othon de la Roche established themselves in the Morea to lay siege to the Greek archon Leo Sgourus's fortresses of Acrocorinth, Argos, and Nauplia.⁶ Most of the Morea was brought under Latin domination in the months that followed, owing to the prowess of Champlitte and the younger Villehardouin. But when Leo Sgourus finally killed himself in despair by plunging, on horseback, from the walls of Acrocorinth (in 1208),⁷ Corinth, Argos, and Nauplia were se-

¹ J. B. Guillaume, *Histoire généalogique des sires de Salins au comté de Bourgogne*, I (Besançon, 1757), 65 ff., 83–85 (an account, as Gregorovius observes, "mit manchen Irrtümern" [*Gesch. d. Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* . . . , I (Stuttgart, 1889), 297, n. 2]); F. I. Dunod de Charnage, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du comté de Bourgogne*, Besançon, 1740, pp. 102 ff., 109–12, and *Histoire des Séquanois, . . . des Bourguignons*, . . . , Dijon, 1735, pp. 297–98. The arms of the de la Roche of Athens were "gueules à quatre points équipolés d'hermine" (Dunod, *Mémoires*, p. 105), described by Guillaume, *op. cit.*, I, 85, as "cinq points d'or équipolés à quatre d'hermines." See J. A. C. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, I, pt. 1 (Paris, 1845), p. lxxxv.

² Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, par. 152, ed. Edmond Faral, 2 vols., Paris, 1938–39, I, 150, 152; ed. Natalis de Wailly (2nd ed., Paris, 1874), chap. xxx, p. 84.

³ *Ibid.*, par. 167, ed. Faral, I, 168; ed. Wailly, chap. xxxiv, p. 94.

⁴ *Ibid.*, par. 450, ed. Faral, II, 264; ed. Wailly, chap. civ, p. 268; also Faral, II, pars. 457–58, 496. Cf. Robert de Clari,

La Conquête de Constantinople, par. cxv, ed. Ph. Lauer, Paris, 1924, p. 107, where Othon de la Roche is not mentioned; Ernst Gerland, *Latein. Kaiserreich*, Homburg v. d. Höhe, 1905, repr. Darmstadt, 1966, pp. 100–1; and Leopoldo Usseglio, *I Marchesi di Monferrato*, II (Turin, 1926), 260.

⁵ Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, ad ann. 1207 (?), in the new Muratori, *RISS*, XII-1 (Bologna, 1938 ff.), 283: "Achaici tunc et Athenienses per suos nuncios se Venetis submiserunt, sed cum civitates optinere disponent, a Campanis quibus preerat dominus Delaroza non sine sanguinis effusione prohibiti sunt." Cf. Lorenzo Monaci [de Monacis, d. 1429], *Chronicon de rebus venetis*, ed. Flaminio Cornelius, Venice, 1758, lib. viii, p. 143, and Stefano Magno, *Estratti degli Annali veneti*, ed. Chas. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, p. 179: "De Atheniensium legatis sese Venetis dediturorum."

⁶ Nicetas Choniates, *Urbs capta*, 9 (Bonn, p. 806), and cf. Villehardouin, *Conquête*, ed. Faral, II, pars. 301, 324, 331–32, on the sieges of Nauplia by Boniface of Montferrat and of Corinth by Jacques d'Avesnes, who joined Boniface and Othon de la Roche in the Morea after securing Euboea.

⁷ Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, Cod. Pal. graecus 226, fol. 122^r, lines 22–23: "Ἰνα γὰρ μὴ δούλειον ἡμᾶρ ἰδῇ, αὐτῷ γε

cured by Michael Ducas of Epirus, who sent his enterprising brother Theodore to rule over them as his lieutenant. After the death of Sgourus the Greeks of the Morea looked upon the Ducae of Epirus as their natural protectors and the champions of their cause. The allegiance of Monemvasia was also gained by the Ducae a little later, and this impregnable fortress long remained their stronghold in the Morea. In the meantime, the death of the odious Sgourus may have seemed, if only for a few months, to have strengthened the Greek position in the Morea, for the Ducae were able and determined.⁸ Sgourus died, says Gregorovius, "a free man and a Greek;"⁹ at least he was a Greek, as Michael Choniates sadly acknowledged, and he died a fitting death. We have already observed that Michael emphasizes that the Latins were humane and civilized in comparison with Sgourus, and that the native Athenians and Thebans lived relatively undisturbed in their ancient homes under Othon de la Roche. Instances of Greeks' serving the Latin conquerors were not uncommon, and remained of course a characteristic aspect of the two and a half centuries of Latin hegemony in Greece.

From the early days of the conquest we also find the pope complaining of Latin knights in the employ of Greeks.¹⁰ In December, 1210, Innocent III bitterly lamented the fact that Latin

knights, *cupiditate caecati*, were serving Michael Ducas of Epirus in his attacks upon the castles and towns of the Latin Emperor Henry and upon the Latin clergy, members of which class (when he could secure their persons) Michael was said to have executed. Other Latin knights entered the service of Theodore Lascaris of Nicaea, *qui pro imperatore se gerit*, because he paid them higher wages. Innocent inveighed against these hucksters of war; warned of the treachery of the Greeks and their hatred of the Latins, "whom even now they call dogs;" and directed the Latin patriarch, Tommaso Morosini, henceforth to excommunicate such Latin *fautores Graecorum*, whose activities threatened the interests of the Latin empire and imperiled its very survival.¹¹ In August, 1211, Innocent ordered the investigation of the archbishop-elect of Neopatras, who according to his cathedral clergy, complainants against him before the Curia, had assisted Leo Sgourus, late lord of Corinth, by actually bearing arms against his fellow Latins, some of whom are said to have been killed, and this on behalf of that evil Greek Sgourus, whom the Latin cleric is stated to have served "for a year and more!"¹² The Greek rulers in Corinth, Epirus, and Nicaea had obviously worked hard, and not entirely without success, to exploit the hostility which existed between the followers of Boniface of Montferrat and those of the Latin Emperor Henry, which in 1208-1209 became a dangerous struggle, to which we have already given some attention.

When Pope Innocent turned to the organization of the Latin Church in Attica and Boeotia, he naturally pursued the policy being followed by the Curia Romana in the so-called principality of Achaia. He tried to preserve the framework of the Greek Church. We may note a papal letter of 25 March, 1210, which is especially significant in this connection, whereby the pope ordered the whole Achaean hierarchy "that they should remain content, in their bishoprics, with those boundaries which it is known that their Greek predecessors had had."¹³

ἵππων ἐαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀκροκόρινθων [ὁ Σγουρὸς] κατέβαλεν, ὡς μὴδ' οὐτοῖν αὐτῷ σῶον ὑπολείπειν. The passage occurs in a text published by Sp. P. Lampros, "Two Petitions of the Metropolitan of Monemvasia to the Patriarch," *Neos Hellenomnemon*, XII (1915), 288; on the nature and historical background of the text, see K. M. Setton, in *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 525-26, note; and on the MS., a fifteenth-century miscellany on paper, cf. Henry Stevenson, ed., *Codices manuscripti Palatini graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* . . . , Rome, 1885, pp. 120-22.

⁸ Cf. Villehardouin, *Conquête*, ed. Faral, II, pars. 301, 328, 331-32; Henri de Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1948, par. 584, p. 69; Innocent III, *Epp.*, an. XIII, no. 161, dated 31 Oct. 1210 (PL 216, 338D): ". . . bellum contra Michalicium . . ."; *ibid.*, no. 184 (PL 216, 353-54), dated 7 Dec. 1210 (very important); an. XIV, ep. 98 (PL 216, 460-61); and an. XV, ep. 77 (PL 216, 598A), dated 25 May, 1212, the Latins having taken Corinth in 1210: ". . . Theodorus Graecus, quondam dominus Corinthi. . . ." Cf. *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 92-101, pp. 23-25, and Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 225 (repr. New York, 1960, I, 159).

⁹ *Stadt Athen*, I (1889), 344.

¹⁰ Cf. Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 24 (PL 216, 222B), dated 22 March, 1210: ". . . quidam ex Latinis ibidem [i.e. in partibus Achaiae] morantibus, ut alios Latinos impugnent, Graecis temere adhaerere praesumunt."

¹¹ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 184 (PL 216, 353-54), dated 7 December, 1210; Aug. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1874-75, no. 4139 (vol. I, p. 357).

¹² Inn. III, an. XIV, ep. 98 (PL 216, 460-61), dated 21 August, 1211; Potthast, no. 4299 (vol. I, pp. 370-71).

¹³ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 26 (PL 216, 223A); Potthast, no. 3944 (vol. I, p. 341): ". . . mandamus quod in episcopatibus vestris illis contenti terminis existatis quos Graecos praedecessores vestros constiterit habuisse." The Church in this regard followed the same practice as the Latin laity: when they took over Greek lands, the Latin lords regularly

As in Achaea, so in Athens, and a Frenchman named Bérard was appointed to the archiepiscopal throne of the celebrated Michael Choniates.

The background of Bérard's appointment as archbishop of Athens is not known; he may have been the chaplain or almoner of Othon de la Roche or one of the clerics attending Boniface of Montferrat. In any event his selection was agreeable to Innocent III, who confirmed him in the entire jurisdiction which his Greek predecessor had exercised over the churches and the clergy of the Athenian province (on 27 November, 1206).¹⁴ Bérard took up his residence on the Acropolis, perhaps in the very rooms that had been occupied by the Metropolitan Michael. Innocent III showed much concern over the organization of the Church of Athens. On 10 July, 1208, he confirmed its privileges and possessions and took it "under the protection of the Blessed Peter and our own."¹⁵ Four days later, on 14 July, the cardinal legate Benedict having already, some time before, established the number of canons to serve on the cathedral staff of the Parthenon, Innocent granted Archbishop Bérard's request that the Church of Athens should be accorded the customs of the Church of Paris.¹⁶ On 23 January,

sought to preserve the social and legal conditions which had obtained under the Greeks before them. Thus in 1206 Theodore Branas, the famous Greek magnate who went over to the Latins, received Adrianople from the Venetians to hold, as a member of the crusaders' host, but "according to the custom of the Greeks," *secundum usum Grecorum* (G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–57, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, II, doc. CLXIX, p. 18). When in 1207 the Doge Pietro Ziani ceded the castle of Corfu, the island, and its dependencies to certain Venetian citizens, they agreed that "quos omnes et alios in ipsis insulis consistentes debemus in suo statu tenere, nichil ab aliquo amplius exigentes, quam quod facere consueverant temporibus Grecorum Imperatorum" (*ibid.*, II, doc. CLXXXII, p. 57). In March, 1209, Ravano dalle Carceri recognized the doge as his suzerain for the island of Negroponte, and he agreed that "Grecos . . . tenebit in eo statu, quo domini Emanuelis Imperatoris tempore tenebantur" (*ibid.*, II, docs. CCIV, p. 92, and CCV, p. 95).

¹⁴ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 194 (PL 215, 1031); Potthast, no. 2922 (vol. I, p. 249): ". . . omnem jurisdictionem, quam Graecus archiepiscopus super ecclesias et clericos Atheniensis provinciae rationaliter habuit . . . auctoritate apostolica confirmamus. . . ." The date of Bérard's death and how many years he was archbishop are still unknown (cf. Michel Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, III [Paris, 1740; repr. Graz, 1958], col. 839; C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I [1913, repr. 1960], p. 114).

¹⁵ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 112 (PL 215, 1432D); Potthast, no. 3453 (vol. I, p. 297).

¹⁶ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 113 (PL 215, 1433A); Potthast, no. 3456 (vol. I, p. 297): ". . . nos postulationi vestrae grato

1209, papal protection of the archbishop and the Church of Athens was reaffirmed, pursuant to, it is declared, the especial request of Archbishop Bérard.¹⁷ Three weeks later, on 13 February, Innocent sent Bérard a long declaration and detailed confirmation of his rights, possessions, and immunities, obviously based upon documents defining the metropolitan authority of Bérard's Greek predecessors. The document was apparently drafted by the papal chancellor John, cardinal deacon of the once Greek church of S. Maria in Cosmedin, who began the grant quite properly with a consideration of the "ancient glory of the city of Athens," where the worship of three false gods had been but a prelude to trinitarian truth, where an altar had been raised to an unknown God, but where the Virgin Mother of the true God now held sway in "Pallas's far-famed citadel." "A city of high renown and perfect beauty, teacher of philosophy and student of the apostolic faith, she inspired the poets and understood the prophets, and was well called the mother of arts and hailed the city of letters."¹⁸ In solemn tones Bérard was reminded of the honor and responsibility that were his when the pope conferred upon him, *juste ac canonice*, the many properties and the large jurisdiction that constituted the archbishopric of Athens. Thus was Bérard confirmed yet again in his high office, but this time his authority over the Latin clergy of the Church of Athens was more explicitly defined. The pope's letter of 13 February, 1209, has been aptly called by a French scholar "the constitution of the Latin Church of Athens."¹⁹

Among the names of twenty-five towns and

concurrentes assensu, universitati vestrae concedimus quatenus . . . eam secundum consuetudinem [institutiones] Parisiensis Ecclesiae libere ordinetis."

¹⁷ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 238 (PL 215, 1549C); Potthast, no. 3623 (vol. I, p. 313).

¹⁸ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 256 (PL 215, 1559–60); Potthast, no. 3654 (vol. I, p. 315): "Civitas quidem ipsa praeclari nominis ac perfecti decoris philosophicam prius artem erudiens, et in apostolica fide postmodum erudita, dum et poetas litteris imbuit et prophetas demum ex litteris intellexit, dicta est mater artium et vocata civitas litterarum." Longnon has suggested that this letter may reflect Bérard's own enthusiasm for Athens and may in fact rehearse his very words to the Curia Romana (*L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, pp. 214–15).

¹⁹ R. Janin, "Athènes," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, V (1931), col. 22: "la charte constitutive de l'Église latine d'Athènes," and see in general Jean Longnon, "L'Organisation de l'église d'Athènes par Innocent III," *Mémorial Louis Petit*, Bucharest and Limoges, 1948, pp. 336–40, 343 ff.

villages, in the possession of which Bérard was confirmed, appear those of Phyle (*Felin*), Menidi (which has remained unchanged), and Marathon (*Mareton*); but for the most part these names were wholly unfamiliar to the scribe, and he has made some of them wholly unintelligible to us. Innocent declared Bérard's jurisdiction over the eleven suffragan bishoprics, which with changes and vicissitudes had been the charge of the metropolitan of Athens for centuries (*ab antiquis temporibus*): 1) Negroponte, 2) Thermopylae (*eccl. Cermopilensis*), 3) Daulia, 4) Aulon, 5) Oreos (*Zorconensis*), 6) Carystus, 7) Coronea, 8) Andros, 9) Megara, 10) Skyros (*Squirensis*), and 11) Ceos.²⁰ About twenty monasteries are

mentioned in the grant, one or two of them famous: Kaisariané (*abbatia S. Siriani*), S. John "the Hunter," S. Nicholas of Katapersica, S. Nicholas "of the Columns" (probably at Sunium), S. Mary of Blachernae, Dionysius the Areopagite, S. Luke, S. George "of the Island" (i.e. Makronesi), and the rest we need not mention.²¹

About 1207 Othon de la Roche bestowed the beautiful abbey of Daphni, on the road from Athens to Eleusis, upon the Cistercian monks of the Burgundian abbey of Bellevaux.²² But even the customs of Notre Dame de Paris did not make Athens seem like home to its Frankish clergy, and at Bérard's request the pope had to insist that certain canons of the Athenian Church, who were unwilling to serve in person in the Parthenon, should take up their reluctant residence on the Acropolis.²³ On 23 January, 1209, the pope took one Robert de Suciaco, a "canon of Athens," under his protection, and confirmed him in the prebend which he had received on the cathedral staff of the Parthenon.²⁴ Robert had requested papal intervention on his own behalf, and Innocent sent a favorable response to his petition; similar letters of protection and confirmation were sent at the same time to two canons of the Church of Thebes and to the dean of the Church of Daulia.²⁵ Innocent's interference in the internal affairs of the Athenian province must have caused the new archbishop some uneasiness. Bérard tried to force residence in Athens upon some unwilling members of his chapter, and certain clerics under his jurisdiction sought papal confirmation of their offices; this was a not uncommon procedure, however, and does not necessarily bespeak any

²⁰ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 256 (*PL* 215, 1560). The Byzantine *taktika* (*notitiae episcopatum*) from the beginning of the tenth century show Athens to have had metropolitan jurisdiction over much the same suffragan sees as appear in Innocent's letter (*cf.* Heinrich Gelzer, "Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum," *Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wissen., Philos.-philol. Cl.*, XXI [1901], 556), and there is some continuity even into the Turkish period (*ibid.*, p. 634). See also Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis romani*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 75. *Cf.* Gregorovius-Lampros, *Athens* (in Greek), I (1904), 409–10. T. D. Neroutsos, "Christian Athens" (in Greek), in *Δελτίον της ιστορικης και εθνολογικης Εταιρίας της Ελλάδος*, IV (Athens, 1892), 59, and J. B. Bury, "The Lombards and Venetians in Euboea," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, VII (1886), 318–19, believed that *Zorconensis* refers to Zarka (the ancient Zarex), in southern Euboea, while it was Hopf's conjecture that "Zorcon" was Oreos, commonly listed as a suffragan bishopric of Athens, and in this identification Hopf has been generally and correctly followed, as by Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, p. 68, and Janin, *Diction. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclési.*, V (1931), col. 23. In 1222 the papal legate Giovanni Colonna, who had received from Pope Honorius III the authority *ecclesias dividere et unire* (*Regesta Honorii Papae III*, ed. Pietro Pressutti, I [Rome, 1888], no. 536, p. 94, dated 24 April, 1217), united the three Euboeote bishoprics of Carystus, Aulon, and Oreos with Negroponte (*ibid.*, vol. II [1895], no. 3844, p. 50, dated 11 March, 1222), but since the see of Negroponte had thus been so increased in its jurisdiction and in importance, the pope on 18 September, 1223, took away from Negroponte *plura loca*, which he joined to the archdiocese of Athens (*ibid.*, II, no. 4501, p. 163). In 1222 Megara was also restored to the jurisdiction of the Church of Athens (*ibid.*, II, no. 3844, p. 50). During the Byzantine period the see of Megara had declined to nothing (*ἐπισκοπή ἀμαυρωθείσα*), was re-established by imperial decree and synodal action, and was restored to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Athens (Theodore Balsamon, *In can. XIII Conc. VII oecumen.*, in *PG* 137, 956B). There are various data relating to the organization of the Latin Church in Greece in the notes with which R. J. Loenertz begins his article, "Athènes et Néopatras: Regestes et documents pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique. . ." *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXVIII (1958), esp. pp. 9 ff, and see Giorgio Fedalto, "La Chiesa latina di Atene e la sua provincia ecclesiastica (1204–1456)," in *Thesaurismata*, II (Venice, 1974), 73–88.

²¹ Inn. III, *ep. cit.*, in *PL* 215, 1560–61.

²² Gabr. Millet, *Le Monastère de Daphni*, Paris, 1899, p. 31; Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *The Church of Athens* (in Greek), Athens, 1928, p. 41. According to Dunod, the cartulary of Bellevaux contains "les titres de plusieurs dons faits à cette Abbaie par les seigneurs de Ray et de la Roche, datés de leurs villes d'Athènes et de Thèbes" (*Hist. des Séquanais*, p. 297, and *Mémoires*, p. 105).

²³ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 246 (*PL* 215, 1551CD); Potthast, no. 3630 (vol. I, p. 313), dated 24 January, 1209: ". . . quidam Ecclesiae tuae [i.e. Archiepiscopi Atheniensis] canonici nolunt Atheniensi ecclesiae, prout tenentur, personaliter deservire . . . praesentium tibi auctoritate concedimus ut ipsos . . . tibi compellere liceat ad debitam in ipsa ecclesia residentiam faciendam." The archbishop of Patras also had trouble with a clergy unwilling "personally to serve" (Inn. III, an. X, ep. 50, in *PL* 215, 1142; Potthast, no. 3095 [vol. I, p. 263], dated 28 April, 1207).

²⁴ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 240 (*PL* 215, 1550A); Potthast, no. 3625 (vol. I, p. 313).

²⁵ Inn. III, an. XI, epp. 239, 241–43 (*PL* 215, 1549–50); Potthast, nos. 3624, 3626–28 (vol. I, p. 313), dated 23 January, 1209.

friction with their archbishop, who was apparently an amicable person. After his elevation to the archbishopric, to be sure, Bérard did not get along well with Othon de la Roche and some of the other barons, most notably Ravano dalle Carceri, but his relations with his cathedral staff appear on the whole to have been satisfactory; he was able, for example, so to effect a division of the income and the facilities of the Church of Athens between himself and the chapter that they themselves presumably described it to the pope as a "compositio . . . amicabiliter inita."²⁶ Such a solution to what was one of the chief problems in most of the Latin churches in Greece brought comfort to Innocent III, for even the most casual reader of the papal correspondence must be impressed with the extent to which squabbles over money and property threatened the new Latin states both in continental Greece and in the Morea.

The organization of the Latin Church in Greece, as understood by the papal Curia, may be studied in the lists of the *Provinciale Romanum*, or catalogue of the archbishoprics and some other jurisdictions of the Roman Church, as established after the Fourth Crusade. From Giraldus Cambrensis we get an interesting picture of Pope Innocent III consulting such a survey of ecclesiastical provinces, shortly before the crusade had so considerably increased the size of the register by making necessary the addition of the conquered Byzantine patriarchate. While Giraldus was in Rome, seeking papal approbation of his election to the see of S. David's in Wales, and seeking also confirmation of the independence of S. David's from the provincial jurisdiction of Canterbury, he discussed these matters with Innocent in the pleasant seclusion of the papal apartment. Innocent was in an especially jovial mood that evening, and in the course of his discussion of the affairs of S. David's with Giraldus, "the pope orders that the register be brought, in which are enumerated the churches of every kingdom in the whole of Christendom subject to the pope, both the metropolitan sees, arranged according to their rank, and the episcopal sees suffragan to them."²⁷ A text of the *Provinciale*, apparently

dating from about 1211 or so, is to be found in the *Liber provincialis*, later called the *Liber cancellariae*, or manual of clerks of the papal chancery. Another text was incorporated in the edition of the *Liber censuum* prepared in 1228 for the officials of Pope Gregory IX. In these texts of the *Provinciale*, redactions that postdate the Fourth Crusade, the archbishopric of Athens is listed as having under it eight suffragan bishoprics: 1) Thermopylae, 2) Daulia, 3) Salona (from 1228), 4) Negroponte, 5) Aulon (*Abelonensis*), 6) Oreos, 7) Megara, and 8) Skyros. Four of the bishoprics named in Pope Innocent's letter to Archbishop Bérard are not listed, and one apparently "new" see, Salona, now appears under Athenian jurisdiction.²⁸ Actually, how-

et affabilem ipsum invenit. Inter primos igitur affatus, cum de iure Menevensis ecclesiae [Menevia is S. David's, Wales] metropolitico mentio facta fuisset, praecipit papa registrum afferri, ubi de universo fidelium orbe singulorum regnorum tam metropoles per ordinem quam earum quoque suffraganeae numerantur ecclesiae pontificales."

²⁸ The text of the *Provinciale Romanum*, dating from about 1211 (from the *Liber provincialis*), may be found in Michael Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200–1500*, Innsbruck, 1894, repr. 1959, p. 29 (list of Athenian suffragans); the oldest MS. of this *Provinciale* is Cod. 275 of the Spanish College of Bologna, dating from after 1278 (Tangl, *op. cit.*, pp. LXIII–LXV), but describing the Graeco-Roman Church of about 1211; for the date of the *Provinciale* and its relation to the *Liber censuum*, see D. Rattinger, "Der Patriarchatsprengel von Constantinopel . . . zur Zeit der Lateinerherrschaft in Byzanz," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, II (1881), 27–32 ff., 38, 43 ff. For the text of the *Provinciale* incorporated in the *Liber censuum* in 1228, see Paul Fabre and Louis Duchesne, *Le Liber censuum de l'église romaine* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 2nd series), vol. II, fasc. 5 (Paris, 1905), p. 8 (list of Athenian suffragans); and see the analyses of R. L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople," *Traditio*, VI (1948), 48 ff., 55, 58, who follows Fabre in listing Thermopylae, Salona (i.e. Amphissa), and Megara as new foundations (Fabre, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n. 1). Wolff believes that Thermopylae was set up as a new bishopric between 1205 and 1209, Salona between 1209 and 1230, but the appointment of a Latin bishop seems always to have presupposed the anterior existence of a Greek diocese. As for Thermopylae, a letter of Innocent III dated 6 February, 1209 (*Epp.*, an. XI, no. 252, in *PL* 215, 1557AB; Potthast, no. 3648 [vol. I, p. 314]), relates that since Thermopylae had once been destroyed by the inroads of war, the bishop and canons of the time had built an oratory to celebrate the divine service at Boudonitza, which was however so exposed to attack by pirates and other marauders that the terrified canons abandoned their attempts to say mass, and sought safety in flight after the present bishop's second predecessor (*tertius a praefato episcopo qui nunc praeest*) was killed by such malefactors, showing that in 1209 the bishop of Thermopylae had (who knows how many) predecessors. It would seem safe to assume that Salona too was not a new foundation since we know that Megara was not. Although Megara may have died a natural death in early Byzantine times, it had been revived well before the Fourth Crusade and returned as a suffragan see to the metropolitan

²⁶ Inn. III, an. XIV, ep. 112 (*PL* 216, 471D); Potthast, no. 4310 (vol. I, p. 371), dated 30 September, 1211.

²⁷ Giraldus Cambrensis, *De iure et statu Menevensis ecclesiae*, dist. II, ed. J. S. Brewer, in *Gir. Cambr. Opera*, III (1863), 165: "Accidit autem, ut vespera quadam, cum ad papam [Inn. III] in camera sua Giraldus accessisset, cum semper eum benignum satis et benevolum, ut videbatur, invenire consueverit; tunc forte praeter solitum amicabilem magis

ever, since so little is known of the origin of the *Provinciale*, its data must be used with some caution.

The Greek bishops of the fallen Byzantine empire were given every opportunity to retain their sees by accepting papal supremacy and the *filioque* clause, and entering the Latin fold. On 2 August, 1206, in reply to a series of disciplinary and other questions addressed to him by the Patriarch Tommaso Morosini, Innocent III laid down the lines of the Latin ecclesiastical policy to be pursued in Greece. The eastern empire had but lately exchanged its schismatic faith and governance for Latin rule; events had produced new conditions and new problems; and the patriarch was to proceed with the greatest possible circumspection. "Certain of the bishops of Romania, although warned, disdain to obey you," Innocent wrote Morosini, echoing the latter's own words, "but they do not cease to collect their episcopal revenues; certain others have fled from their episcopacies, so that they cannot be warned, deserting their dioceses for six months or even longer." Greek bishops who acknowledged the supremacy of the pope and the Latin patriarch might retain their episcopal charges. Recalcitrants were to receive three separate admonitions, after which they could be removed from their sees, and Latin bishops appointed in their stead.²⁹

You have asked, next, to be instructed by the Apostolic See as to what sort of ordination you should make in those bishoprics where only Greeks are living, and whom you should appoint in those where Greeks

and Latins are mixed together. In answer we briefly reply to your Grace that in those churches in which there are only Greeks, you ought to ordain Greek bishops, if you are able to find any who will be devoted and faithful to us and to yourself, and who will accept, with humble devotion, consecration at your hands. In those dioceses, however, in which Greeks are mixed with Latins, appoint Latins and prefer Latins to Greeks.³⁰

Among the few Greek ecclesiastics who did accept papal supremacy and Latin authority, there was one important figure in Greece itself. This was Theodore, bishop of Negroponte, the friend and former suffragan of Michael Choniates, who continued his correspondence with him; in the early days of the conquest, on 27 November, 1206, Innocent III sent a bull of papal protection to the Greek clergy of Negroponte.³¹ Bishop Theodore became, however, an object of annoyance and suspicion to the Latin Archbishop Bérard, who removed him and appointed another to his see. But Innocent ordered the archbishop of Neopatras and two other Latin ecclesiastics to effect Theodore's restoration, for his only offense appeared to be his unwillingness to be reconsecrated *juxta consuetudinem Latinorum*, and in his appeal to the pope, Theodore had asserted his willingness to render "canonical obedience" both to Innocent and to Bérard himself; the dispossessed cleric was to be allowed to resume his cathedra, and interference with his doing so would be met with "ecclesiastical censure."³² Theodore was presumably reinstated as bishop of Negroponte, and Bérard's troubles continued. Theodore seems to have received the support of Ravano dalle Carceri, triarch of Negroponte from August, 1205, to 1208 and thereafter sole lord until his death in 1216.

of Athens (Theodore Balsamon, *In can. XIII Conc. VII oecumen.*, in PG 137, 956B, an important text apparently overlooked by Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 10–11). Salona was a "new" bishopric only in name since Loenertz is doubtless right in seeing it as a continuation of the Greek bishopric of Loidoriki (*op. cit.*, pp. 14–15).

The *Liber censuum* was a survey of the sources of certain papal revenue, first compiled in 1192 by Cencio Savelli, then papal camerarius and afterwards Pope Honorius III (*cf.* Paul Fabre, *Étude sur le Liber censuum de l'église romaine*, Paris, 1892, and Wm. E. Lunt, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols., New York, 1934, I, 10, 38, and II, 34–35). The *Provinciale Romanum* does not give Carystus, Coronea, Andros, and Ceos as suffragan sees of Athens, and Loenertz, *op. cit.*, p. 15, has shown that Aegina is improperly supposed to occupy the eighth place in the list, to which he has rightly restored the island of Skyros.

²⁹ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 140 (PL 215, 963); Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, II (1856), doc. CLXX, pp. 19 ff.; Potthast, no. 2860 (vol. I, p. 245). Much the same instructions were given to the Latin archbishop of Patras on 19 April, 1207 (Inn. III, an. X, ep. 51 [PL 215, 1142–43]; Potthast, no. 3090 [vol. I, p. 262]).

³⁰ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 140 (PL 215, 964AB).

³¹ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 193 (PL 215, 1030D); Potthast, no. 2921 (vol. I, p. 249). The Greek Bishop John of Rhædestus (*ep. Redostonensis*, on the Sea of Marmara), also a correspondent of Michael Choniates (ed. Sp. P. Lampros, II [Athens, 1880], 334, cited by Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich* [1905], p. 233, n. 6), appears to have subordinated himself to the pope and the Latin Church (Inn. III, an. XV, epp. 134–35, in PL 216, 647, dated 14 July, 1212). *Cf.* Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1212, no. 42, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 329.

³² Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 179 (PL 215, 1492–93); Potthast, no. 3552 (vol. I, p. 306), doc. dated 8 December, 1208. The validity of consecration according to the Greek rite had already been accepted by Innocent nine months before (on 8 March, 1208), although all consecrations of bishops thereafter were to be according to the Latin rite, *ut recipient unctionem* (an. XI, ep. 23 [PL 215, 1353A], and *cf.* an. XI, ep. 155 [*ibid.*, col. 1468D]).

It was conceivably through Ravano's influence that Theodore had retained possession of his bishopric in 1206, for a Greek ecclesiastic, acceptable to the Latin Church, could be of invaluable assistance to Ravano in consolidating and perhaps in extending his "third" on the island of Negroponte. Ravano was a person of considerable enterprise. He had loved the wife of another man, and after the latter's death, with which the lady may possibly have had something to do, Ravano wished to marry her. Whether Archbishop Bérard, who had metropolitan authority over the Euboeote sees, might have condoned the vagaries of Ravano's private life is difficult to say, but he seems to have found intolerable Ravano's public association with Bishop Theodore of Negroponte. Be that as it may, he put Ravano under the ban of excommunication. Ravano had powerful friends, however, especially among the Venetian clergy who controlled the Latin patriarchate, and in May, 1212, Innocent III rescinded the archbishop's ban, provided that Ravano's pact with the lady, who was named Isabella, did not antedate her husband's death, and provided too that his death was not contrived by her for the purpose it had finally served.³³

In Attica and Boeotia as elsewhere in Greece and the Morea, under the Latin archbishops of Athens and Thebes and the Latin canons of their cathedral chapters, most of the parish priests who administered the sacraments to the faithful, especially in the smaller villages, were Greek. It could hardly have been otherwise. The needs of the Greek peasant, living in the rural parish (*papatus*), could be met only by one who spoke his language, and who remained, after the Latin conquest as before it, a Greek priest (*παπᾶς*, *papas*).³⁴ At the second Parlia-

ment of Ravennika (on 2 May, 1210), which removed some of the friction between the papacy and the Frankish states in Greece, it was decided that the Greek priests should continue to pay the controverted land tax (*crustica*, *akrostichon*) to their lay lords. The crusaders insisted upon regarding Greek ecclesiastical property as part of the spoils of their victory, a point of view which Innocent III, as we have seen, had condemned from the first weeks of the Latin conquest of Constantinople. Latin priests were also to pay the land tax. Nevertheless, peace had to be made, and Innocent felt constrained to confirm the statutes of Ravennika on 21 December, 1210, while the barons granted exemption from feudal jurisdiction to all ecclesiastical persons and properties from the borders of the kingdom of Thessalonica to the city of Corinth, *salvo tamen terrarum censu qui crustica Graeco vocabulo nuncupatur et dudum solvebatur a Graecis*.³⁵

Before the settlement Innocent had been constantly exercised by the stubborn insistence of the barons upon collecting the Greek land tax from the clergy resident in their lands. Thus on 14 July, 1208, he had forbidden the *domini Thebarum* to "extort" from the Theban Church and the clergy of the archdiocese the *akrostichon* or anything else contrary to justice, while he also enjoined upon them their duty as good Christians to pay the tithe and to see that their subjects both Greek and Latin paid it too.³⁶

to the *papatus*, or parishes under Greek priests, may suffice: the Greek priests who are said by the chronicler Henri de Valenciennes to have received the Emperor Henry with great enthusiasm survived (and outlasted) the Latin conquest of their country. Note Chas. Du Cange, *Gloss. . . . Latinitatis*, s. *papas* (vol. V [Paris, 1845], pp. 66-67); Gerland, *Latén. Kaiserreich*, p. 197; Wolff, in *Traditio*, VI, 41; and Innocent's reference to the *papates et possessiones ecclesiasticae* to be restored by the constable of Thessalonica to the *ecclesia Dimicensis* (an. XI, ep. 120 [PL 215, 1434D-1435A]), and *papates et bona ecclesiastica* in a letter of Honorius III (an. III, ep. 237, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, Athens, 1906, pt. I, doc. 10, p. 13). Cf. *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio (1885), par. 134, p. 31: ". . . et á todos los monesterios et todos los capellanes griegos dexaron [i.e. the Latin lords of Achaea] sus posesiones et sus yglesias."

³³ Inn. III, an. XV, epp. 100-1 (PL 216, 612-13); Potthast, nos. 4485, 4498 (vol. I, pp. 387, 388), dated 23 and 25 May, 1212. On Ravano dalle Carceri, see R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280," in *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), nos. 5-9, 11-12, 14-15, 18-19, 21, pp. 238-43, and David Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, Paris, 1971, pp. 185-89.

³⁴ On 21 May, 1212, Innocent III wrote the archbishop of Thebes that the archbishop of Corinth had been inveigled by the dean and canons of Corinth into granting them "medietas omnium decimarum monasteriorum et *papatuum* in quibus tres monachi vel pauciores morantur" (Epp., an. XV, no. 60, in PL 216, 588AB; Potthast, no. 4464 [vol. I, p. 386]). Cf. an. XVI, ep. 98 (PL 216, 898B), where Prince Geoffrey of Villehardouin of Achaea, the lord Othon de la Roche of Athens, and others are illegally retaining "abbatiae, ecclesiae, *papatus*, decimae et possessiones ad eorum [i.e. of the archbishops of Patras, Neopatras, Thebes, Athens, Corinth, et al.] ecclesias pertinentes." These two references

³⁵ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 192 (PL 216, 360); Potthast, no. 4151 (vol. I, p. 358), dated 21 December, 1210. On the *ἀκρόστιχον*, see Franz Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung, besonders des 10. u. 11. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1927, pp. 47, 77, 107 (Byzantinisches Archiv, vol. 9), and Georg Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen*, Rome, 1934, pp. 170, 177, 189 (Orientalia Christiana, XXXIII-2). Cf. Michael Choniates, *Ep.* 46, 4 (ed. Lampros, II [1880], 75, cited by Dölger, *op cit.*, p. 147), on the *akrostichon* of the island of Aegina.

³⁶ Inn. III, Epp., an. XI, no. 116 (PL 215, 1434); Potthast, no. 3459 (vol. I, p. 297); cf., *ibid.*, ep. 118, which is no. 3461

Othon de la Roche was also warned, in a letter directed to him as lord of Athens, not to extort the tax from the Athenian Church and, again, to see that the Athenian tithes were paid.³⁷ Some months later, on 10 October, 1208, Innocent indignantly informed the archbishop of Athens and two other high ecclesiastics that the lords of Thebes had seized, as the annual land tax, 700 hyperperi of the income of the Church of Thebes, which only amounted to 900 hyperperi, all told, and so left the archbishop and his clergy a mere 200 hyperperi to meet the entire year's expenses! The *domini Thebani* had been supported in this outrage by the vile encouragement of the Hospitallers (*pravis suggestionibus*), who also objected to the payment of tithes and annates.³⁸

Othon de la Roche, whether or not he was one of the lords of Thebes at this time, was the author of much anxiety at the Curia Romana. Shortly after his marriage, probably late in the year 1207, to Isabelle de Ray, Othon had forced Archbishop Bérard of Athens to turn over to him the office of cathedral treasurer (*thesauraria*), possibly with the intention of bestowing it upon some one of Isabelle's relatives.³⁹ Innocent directed the archbishop of Larissa and two of his fellows to investigate and to rectify the situation, which means presumably to remove the incum-

bent—if any and if possible.⁴⁰ On 10 July, 1210, Innocent wrote from the Lateran Palace in Rome "that the noble Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens, and other barons and knights of the empire of Constantinople have in common forbidden, to their most grievous detriment, that anyone in his lifetime should confer any of his possessions upon churches or that anyone on the point of death should make testamentary bequests to churches." The archbishop of Thebes and two episcopal colleagues were directed to warn and to persuade, not short of ecclesiastical censure, de la Roche and the barons in question to relax their restrictions upon the Church.⁴¹

It must not be thought, however, that Othon de la Roche was in any way hostile to the Latin Church, although his name is frequently linked with that of Prince Geoffrey of Villehardouin and spoken of with disapprobation in the documents dealing with the ecclesiastical affairs of Greece. Othon merely wished to realize the greatest possible material advantages from his Greek possessions. The Latin barons had no cause for pursuing an anti-papal policy. It is true that at Ravennika in May, 1210, the secular interests of the Latin empire were defended more firmly than Innocent could have wished; it is also true that the Venetians, who carefully supervised the churches in their Levantine colonies, tended to maintain a rather anti-papal attitude, for the interests of S. Mark seemed not to receive proper consideration in the Lateran Palace. The Latin Patriarch Tommaso Morosini was, more or less, an agent of the Venetian Republic: that was the reason for his election, and the reason for the Venetians' previous reservation of the patriarchate for themselves.

The attitude of the Latin barons in Greece towards the papacy, however, was much the same as they had entertained before 1204; it was opportunistic, but the organization of the Church in western Europe had anticipated and provided for most of the methods and occasions whereby the baronage might express its less pious and more mundane aspirations. In Greece of course new opportunities existed for the bar-

in Potthast (I, 297); Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich*, pp. 197–98. On the fiscal structure of Boeotia in the late eleventh century, see the detailed study of part of a cadastral survey of the area made for the purpose of assessing the land tax (contained in Cod. Vat. graecus 215, fols. 193–96, four leaves from an official register appended to the fourteenth-century MS.) in Nicholas G. Svoronos, "Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: Le Cadastre de Thèbes," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LXXXIII (Athens and Paris, 1959), 1–145, on which see above, Chapter 2, note 30.

³⁷ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 121 (PL 215, 1435); Potthast, no. 3464 (vol. I, p. 298), also dated 14 July, 1208; cf., an. XI, ep. 245 (PL 215, 1551).

³⁸ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 153 (PL 215, 1467D–1468A); Potthast, no. 3513 (vol. I, p. 303); and cf. an. XI, epp. 116–21, 122 (PL 215, 1434–35); Gerland, *Lat. Kaiserreich*, p. 198. In one of these letters, dated 14 July, 1208 (an. XI, ep. 121 [PL 215, 1435B]), Innocent actually calls Othon de la Roche the "duke of Athens" (*dux Athenarum*) although I believe that in all other papal letters Othon is addressed merely as *dominus Athenarum*.

³⁹ Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 69; cf. Gregorovius-Lampros, I (1904), 448. Othon is referred to in the document (for which see the next note) as *uxoratus*. Dunod, *Mémoires* (1740), p. 105, has observed that Othon was not yet Sire de Ray when he acquired the lordship of Athens. Hopf dates his marriage in 1208 (*Chroniques gréco-romanes* [1873], p. 473).

⁴⁰ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 244 (PL 215, 1550–51); Potthast, no. 3629 (vol. I, p. 313), doc. dated 23 January, 1209.

⁴¹ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 110 (PL 216, 302AB; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 2, p. 4); Potthast, no. 4050 (vol. I, p. 349); cf. an. XI, epp. 12–15 (PL 215, 1348–49), dated 12 March, 1208.

onage, like the acquisition of church revenue through the land tax, which the Curia had not been able to forestall. If the barons in Greece were more difficult to control than they had been in Italy and France, the reason is merely that greater opportunities were open to enterprise, *propter novitatem mutationis imperii*, of which Innocent himself spoke more than once,⁴² for from that new world which the crusaders had found and created in Greece new power and new prestige had come, and these they were eager to make bear the greatest possible wealth. The crusaders were always comparatively few among the hostile population of Greece. In Attica and Boeotia the concentration of Latin settlers may have been rather higher than elsewhere; the prosperity, always a relative thing in Greece, of the Burgundian lordship and duchy throughout the thirteenth century seems to testify to the presence of a fair number of Latin inhabitants. In any event, on 9 March, 1210, Pope Innocent wrote, in an unusual letter, that his beloved son Othon de la Roche, the lord of Athens, had asked that in all his castles and villages (*castra sua et villae*), in which twelve Catholics had their fixed abodes, they might have their own priests, for whose maintenance they were to pay tithes and something more if tithes were not sufficient. The pope was anxious to see Othon's request fulfilled.⁴³ There may have been some measure of personal piety in Othon's request, for through these years he remained one of the chief benefactors of the abbey of Bellevaux in Burgundy. He could, on occasion, be generous with the Church in Greece, and in 1211, a year after the land tax had been guaranteed him by the statutes of Ravennika, we find him remitting part of this tax, *pia liberalitate*, to the grateful chapter of Thebes.⁴⁴

Although we find many expressions of general policy to be followed by Latin ecclesiastics, Venetian officials, and others at high social levels towards the Greeks as a whole, homely examples are much less common of how the two peoples

got along in the actual business of living in the markets and castles of the larger towns, on the docks of shipping centers, and among the small flocks of sheep and goats along the dusty roads of little inland villages. Sometimes, however, even in Pope Innocent's correspondence we get a glimpse of such things. Master Hugo, archdeacon of Daulia, was obviously very unpopular among the native Greeks in the little town of Gravia. On one occasion some of them set upon the Latin cleric and beat him up so badly that he thought it worthwhile to address a letter to the Curia Romana on the extent of his injuries, and ask that something be done about the matter. But Greek peasants would not concern themselves about a Latin ban of excommunication; a Greek priest could not be trusted to observe a Latin interdict; and so the papal answer to Master Hugo's appeal was to enlist the secular arm: the Latin baron of Gravia was directed to seize the malefactors and see that Master Hugo received satisfaction.⁴⁵

The bishop of Zaratoria, the modern Zagora, was so poor, he informed the pope, that he could hardly support one canon in proper fashion. Innocent, fearful lest the name of bishop should fall into disrepute merely because of lack of money, asked the archbishop of Thebes to make decent provision for his unhappy suffragan, so that the latter might be able to discharge his duty towards his flock, and so that he need not have to supplement his inadequate resources by engaging in some sort of trade (*nec . . . compellatur se saecularibus negotiis implicare*).⁴⁶ What help the poor bishop might expect of the archbishop and the turbulent canons of Thebes we can imagine from one or two other episodes in his relations with his Theban brothers in Christ. Some of his Frankish congregation, including knights, had a house in Thebes, and when the bishop of Zaratoria excommunicated them, they went to Thebes to attend divine services and were, very improperly, received by the Theban clergy.⁴⁷ On another occasion the dean and some canons of the Theban minster, who had often been a cause of grief to the good bishop of Zaratoria, invaded his diocese carrying arms, seized one of

⁴² *Epp.*, an. IX, ep. 140 (*PL* 215, 963A); an. X, ep. 51 (*PL* 215, 1142C), letters dated 1206 and 1207.

⁴³ Inn. III, an. XIII, ep. 16 (*PL* 216, 216CD; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 1, p. 3); Potthast, no. 3933 (vol. I, p. 340).

⁴⁴ Inn. III, an. XIV, ep. 110 (*PL* 216, 470-71; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 3, pp. 4-5); Potthast, no. 4311 (vol. I, p. 372), dated 1 October, 1211. (After Ravennika the annual "crustica," or *akrostichon*, for which the Theban chapter was bound amounted to 320 hyperperi.)

⁴⁵ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 27 (*PL* 216, 564); Potthast, no. 4424 (vol. I, p. 382), dated 8 April, 1212.

⁴⁶ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 26 (*PL* 216, 564A); Potthast, no. 4425 (vol. I, p. 382), dated 8 April, 1212.

⁴⁷ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 28 (*PL* 216, 564D); Potthast, no. 4421 (vol. I, p. 382), dated 7 April, 1212.

his people, trounced the man severely, and handed him over to a secular judge, who kept him in prison for a long time. Indeed, the dean, two canons, and the castellan of Thebes, *castellanus Thebanus*, an officer of Othon de la Roche, together with some other rowdies, actually broke into the bishop's house, laid violent hands upon his person, and tore from his very arms the man in question.⁴⁸ The bishop, dean, and cantor of Daulia were instructed to caution the archbishop of Thebes and his canons to remain content with their own diocesan boundaries: the harassed bishop of Zaratoria had informed the pope of their frequent invasions of his diocese and the many affronts they had put upon him.⁴⁹ Greek peasants must have thought that they understood a much-disputed parable, for obviously the Latin clergy had come to Greece to bring not peace, but a sword.

In the years that followed, Othon de la Roche was to find himself for long periods under the ban of excommunication and his lands under the interdict, owing to his intransigent attitude towards the Church and his frequent violations of the concordat of Ravennika. Thus in the late summer of 1213 the lord of Athens, together with his friend the prince of Achaea, was still laboring under such ecclesiastical restraints, for the archbishop of Patras had published bans against them both as *jura ecclesiarum . . . graviter perturbantes*.⁵⁰ But Pope Innocent entertained hopes of the concordat, and declared null and void the sentences passed upon both de la Roche and Villehardouin, provided they took an oath to obey the papal mandates sent to them "by letter or by legate."⁵¹ Othon de la Roche is soon found making an obeisance to the Church in rather unusual fashion. In 1214 he gave up the castle of Livadia, the ancient Lebadea in Boeotia, to the cardinal legate Pelagius, even as King John had given up England, and received the castle back from Pelagius as a fief of the Church, agreeing to pay for it a feudal rent of two silver marks a year (on 21

June).⁵² This was probably less a gift to the Church than a means of restricting the diocesan authority of some bishop over Livadia, so that Othon could secure some of the church revenues of the town for himself. Othon was also protected against lay or ecclesiastical interference with his rights and profits in Livadia, which was now a fief of the Holy See.⁵³

Occasionally the stern march of historical events and the tedious, if necessary, statement of facts are broken by some item of more amusing or more personal interest than most of what we learn from the documents which comprise the sparse annals of the churches of Athens and Thebes in the thirteenth century. In 1217, for example, the pope wrote the deans of Athens and Thebes to investigate the conduct of the abbot of Stiris (*Stirensis*) who, according to the report of the vigilant bishop of Daulia, "led a completely dissolute life, squandered the resources of his monastery, and refused to accept the said bishop's correction, declaring that his monastery was free and exempt [from episcopal visitation]."⁵⁴ Various documents make clear the lugubrious fact that, while the Frankish baronage in Greece was adventurous, the clergy was often corrupt, for the clerical immigrants into these newly won lands were rarely among the best types of the Latin priesthood.

Othon de la Roche, however, gradually made his peace with the Church. The Latin empire

⁴⁸ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 30 (*PL* 216, 565–66); Potthast, no. 4428 (vol. I, p. 383), dated 9 April, 1212; cf. Gregorovius-Lampros, *Athens*, I (1904), 405; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, p. 70.

⁴⁹ Inn. III, an. XV, ep. 29 (*PL* 216, 565AB); Potthast, no. 4427 (vol. I, p. 383), dated 9 April, 1212.

⁵⁰ Inn. III, an. XVI, ep. 98 (*PL* 216, 898; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 6, p. 7); Potthast, no. 4798 (vol. I, p. 418), dated 26 August, 1213.

⁵¹ Inn. III, *ep. cit.*, in *PL* 216, 899; Lampros, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

⁵² L. A. Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ mediæ ævi*, V (Milan, 1741; repr. Bologna, 1965), 833–34: ". . . zelo divinæ pietatis accensus . . . duas marchas argenti gratis solvet [Otto de Rocca, dominus Athenarum] Sedi Apostolicæ annuatim." Innocent III confirmed the enfeoffment on 12 January, 1216 (regest in Potthast, no. 5052 [vol. I, p. 444]); see Paul Fabre, "Un *Vidimus* de Conrad, archevêque d'Athènes," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XV (1895), 71 ff., and his *Étude sur le Liber censuum de l'église romaine* (1892), p. 127; cf. Walter Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903 (repr. New York, 1958), pp. 212 ff.; Gregorovius-Lampros, *Athens*, I (1904), 436; and Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, p. 69. This document leads Gerland to think that Pelagius may have been in Athens in 1214 (*Latein. Kaiserreich*, 1905, p. 233, n. 3). Nicholas of S. Omer had given some serfs and properties at Thebes and the village of Ermocastro (*casale quod dicitur Hermocastrum*) to the Premonstratensians of S. Mary's "of the Little Bridge" in Brindisi, a donation confirmed by Innocent on 23 May, 1212 (an. XV, ep. 68, in *PL* 216, 591C; Potthast, no. 4481 [vol. I, p. 387]). Nicholas had come to Greece about 1208–1209.

⁵³ Fabre, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XV (1895), 71–75.

⁵⁴ Hon. III, an. II, ep. 737, in *Regesti del pontefice Onorio III . . .*, ed. Pressutti, I (1884), no. 851, p. 225; *Regesta*, I (1888), no. 892, p. 151, dated 28 November, 1217.

of Constantinople and the kingdom of Thessalonica stood in peril as Greek strength increased in Epirus and in Nicaea. The Curia Romana was willing to let many bygones be bygones in order to secure the strong arms of de la Roche and Villehardouin to defend the interests of Latin Christendom. Pope Honorius III was anxious to settle various long-standing disputes,⁵⁵ and on 4 October, 1223, he informed the deans of the cathedral churches of Negroponte and Thebes that a survey was to be made to define the local possessions and rights of the "patriarch, the chapter, and the corporation of the Frankish churches in Constantinople." After this domesday inquest of patriarchal rights in the Athenian lordship, the patriarch and his procurators were to make no further claims against the lord of Athens (*quod nulla alia a nobili viro . . . domino Athenarum ac suis repetent*), except such as were known and understood to be proper claims of the patriarchal see of Constantinople, and those responsible for pressing such rights should not allow themselves to be dissuaded therefrom "by price, favor, or fear." The clergy were to make truthful declarations of their possessions and tenures, and also of the extent of their obligations to pay the hated *akrosticha*, while a similar regard for truth was to mark the declarations of Othon and his people concerning ecclesiastical possessions and rights, the *akrosticha*, and, in connection with this last, an honest estimate of any depreciation of the value of lands and properties upon which *akrosticha* were due. His Holiness authorized in advance the agreement to be reached by the patriarchal procurators and the lord of Athens; he spoke of the indulgence, up to twenty years, he had granted the latter; the lord of Athens and his followers promised to pay the Church a *census* of sixty hyperperi a year for the ecclesiastical properties they held, provided that neither such properties nor their cultivators were reduced in value below what they were worth at the time of the papal concession. Nevertheless, his Holiness

⁵⁵ An epistle similar to the one sent to Geoffrey I of Villehardouin on 4 September, 1223, whereby he was to pay the Church an annuity of 1,000 hyperperi for the ecclesiastical property and revenues he had seized and still retained (see above, pp. 48–49), was also sent to Othon de la Roche, who was however to pay an annuity of only 500 hyperperi (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. 1, doc. 18, pp. 23–31, and cf. docs. 16–17, and A. L. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III . . .*, Città del Vaticano, 1950, nos. 114–15, pp. 152–59, docs. dated 4 September, 1223).

wanted to maintain the relations which had existed between church and state at the time of the Latin conquest, and it was not his intention to allow the lord of Athens to take over any part of the revenues of the churches belonging to the see of Constantinople.⁵⁶

In 1222 and 1223, Pope Honorius III, anxious about conditions in Greece, whence bad tidings constantly came to him, reorganized much of the structure of church government both in the Morea and in continental Greece, but with his new arrangements in the Morea we are not concerned.⁵⁷ The changes were many, for much had happened, and was even then happening,⁵⁸ and the policy of the Church was to keep abreast of the times: *Tempora mutantur, et mutatur in illis*. For the most part, however, we must confine our attention to Athenian affairs. On 18 September, 1223, the pope wrote the archbishop of Athens of his awareness of the fact that, ever since the Euboeote bishoprics of Aulon or Avlonari (*Abilonensis*), Oreos, and Carystus had been joined to the diocese of Negroponte, which must have lessened the expense and increased the efficiency of administration, the suffragan bishopric of Negroponte seemed to exceed in importance the archdiocese of Athens. The pope therefore transferred from Negroponte to Athens some places ambiguously described as lying between the fountain named Chamac, near the famed "Black Bridge," and the diocese of Thebes, "along the public road to Thebes from Negroponte," and certain other places that one went through by going from Chamac "down to the coast towards Athens" (*citra mare versus Athenas*).⁵⁹

In his lordship of Athens and Thebes, Othon de la Roche may have established a baronial

⁵⁶ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 67 (Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. 1, doc. 20, pp. 32–34); brief summary in Pressutti's *Regesta*, II (1895), no. 4514, p. 165.

⁵⁷ Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 62–63; cf. R. L. Wolff, in *Traditio*, VI (1948), 45 ff.

⁵⁸ On 5 December, 1224, the pope described himself to Othon de la Roche as "anxii et solliciti pro te aliisque Latinis in Romanie imperio constitutis" (Hon. III, an. IX, ep. 85, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. 1, doc. 22, p. 35; *Regesta*, II, no. 5202, p. 286).

⁵⁹ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 49, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. 1, doc. 19, pp. 31–32; *Regesta*, II, no. 4502, p. 163. In 1187 the island of Aegina had been turned over to Michael Choniates by the Patriarch Nicetas II (*Ep.* 46, 4, ed. Lampros, II, 75). In a letter of 11 March, 1222, Honorius III mentions Megara as being "restored" to the Church of Athens (an. VI, ep. 279, in *Regesta*, II, no. 3844, p. 50). Cf. above, note 20.

court (*haute cour*), within the competence of which lay matters relating to his feudatories and their tenures; at the same time, presumably, Othon chose the viscount and jurors of the *cour des bourgeois*, before whom would come most cases involving the free, but non-feudal, Latin inhabitants of the lordship. However, beyond a bare reference to the viscount who presided over the latter court, which has survived in the French version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*, no literary or documentary evidence illustrates the work of either the baronial or the bourgeois courts, nor has a judicial decision from either one been preserved. In the Athenian lordship, Othon de la Roche was, almost, *primus inter impares*, for unlike the prince of Achaea, who was to have trouble with his baronage, Othon had very few important vassals under him.⁶⁰ Few Greek institutions of municipal government had survived the reign of Heraclius, if any lasted so long; Athens had long been ruled by Byzantine imperial and ecclesiastical officials, and these had fled upon the approach of the Latins. Nevertheless, some of the more prominent Greek landholders of Attica and Boeotia were allowed to retain some of their possessions. Their special knowledge of the land and the people was useful to the Latin conquerors. The correspondence of Michael Choniates reveals various members of the Greek archontic class living tranquilly in Athens and Thebes under the regime of Othon de la Roche. And there was little tranquillity in Greece.

Toward the end of the year 1224 the fall of the Latin kingdom of Thessalonica to Theodore Ducas, the able ruler of Epirus (1215–1230),

caused a great stir in Rome, Constantinople, and Nicaea. Theodore was, as we have seen, a restless and dangerous man. In 1226 his forces ranged eastward from Thessalonica, and soon met at Adrianople an army of the Nicene Emperor John III Vatatzes which had just taken the city. The Nicene commanders were obliged to surrender Adrianople to Theodore, who ravaged at will the sadly diminished territories of the Latin empire, "and came up even to the very walls of the city of Constantine and threw a great fear into the Latins."⁶¹ The Curia Romana was naturally much occupied with Greek affairs both before and after Theodore's seizure of the capital of what had been for twenty years a Lombard kingdom. Thus on 25 September, 1223, Pope Honorius had written the archbishop of Athens from Anagni that numerous persons (*phures*) had been excommunicated some time before by the papal legate Giovanni Colonna, who had imposed upon them because of their contumely a journey to Rome as the first step towards their absolution. But now, since the Athenian lordship needed them so badly and travel involved dangers (*propter terre et viarum discrimina*), his Holiness instructed the archbishop of Athens to grant them their desired absolution, provided they would spend what the journey to Rome would have cost them upon the walls of the great castle of Salona (*in munitionem castri de Sola*), fief of the Autremencourt and Athenian buffer against possible attack by Theodore Ducas from either Epirus or Thessalonica.⁶²

In the following February we find the pope concerned about the defense of the castle of Boudonitza, just south of the famous pass of Thermopylae, the fief of its founder Guido Pallavicini (1204–1237),⁶³ bailie of the then beleaguered kingdom of Thessalonica, on whose behalf the pope sought aid, to be rendered *viriliter et potenter*, from Geoffrey I of Ville-

⁶⁰ The viscount who presided over the (later) Athenian *cour des bourgeois* [*Vucomity*] is mentioned in the *Livre de la conquête . . . : Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)*, ed. Jean Longnon, Paris, 1911, par. 880, p. 348. For the courts in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and the principality of Achaea, see J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1291*, Cambridge, Mass., 1932, pp. 87 ff., 105 ff.; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 53 ff.; Gregorovius-Lampros, *Athens* (in Greek), I (1904), 402–4; and especially D. Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale* (1971), *passim*. On the legal institutions of the crusader states in the Holy Land, of some relevance in the present connection, see also various studies by Joshua Prawer, especially "Étude préliminaire sur les sources et la composition du *Livre des Assises des Bourgeois*," *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 1954, pp. 198–227, 358–82; "Étude sur le droit des *Assises de Jérusalem*: Droit de confiscation et droit d'exhérédation," *ibid.*, 1961, pp. 520–51, and *ibid.*, 1962, pp. 29–42; and "La Noblesse et le régime féodal du royaume latin de Jérusalem," *Le Moyen-Âge*, 1959, pp. 41–74 (cited from offprints).

⁶¹ Geo. Acropolites, *Chron.*, 24 (Bonn, pp. 41–44, and ed. Aug. Heisenberg, I [Leipzig, 1903], 38–41, quotation on p. 41); cf. Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzantina*, II, 3 (Bonn, I, 27); Ephraem, *Imperatores*, vv. 8018–45 (Bonn, pp. 323–24). Also see above, Chapter 3.

⁶² Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 29, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 13, p. 19; *Regesta*, II (1895), no. 4509, p. 164.

⁶³ The date of Guido Pallavicini's death remains uncertain, but he made his will on 2 May, 1237 (Pompeo Litta, *Celebri famiglie italiane*, fasc. XLVII [Milan, 1840], dispensa 77, tav. 14). The Pallavicini were a very distinguished family, with large holdings in Parma, Piacenza, and Cremona (cf. *Enciclopedia storico-nobiliare italiana*, V [Milan, 1932], 62–63, and Usseglio, *Marchesi di Monferrato*, II [1926], 308–9).

hardouin, Othon de la Roche, and the noble lords of Negroponte.⁶⁴ In the same vein and to the same persons his Holiness wrote on 5 December, 1224,⁶⁵ by which time the troops of Theodore Ducas may already have entered Thessalonica, and early in the following year (on 12 February, 1225), he tried to encourage Villehardouin, Othon de la Roche, and the other Latin barons with the promise that the marquis of Montferrat was leading an expedition into Greece,⁶⁶ the failure of which we have already noted.

The internal affairs of the Athenian lordship seem to have gone peacefully enough through the twenty years of Othon de la Roche's rule over the historic lands forever associated with the names of Pericles and Epaminondas. His chief difficulties were with the Church, and these largely, it would seem, of his own making. Unlike the prince of Achaea, Othon had under him no powerful and sometimes rebellious barons. The most important and conspicuous figures to be seen, from year to year, in banquet halls in Athens and Thebes were members of Othon's own family, and this continued to be true for most of the thirteenth century. Late in the year 1207 Othon had married Isabelle, daughter and heiress of Guy, sire de Ray, in Franche-Comté; Isabelle bore him two sons, Guy and Othon, whose descendants held the lands of the de la Roche and Ray into the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries respectively. As the years passed, some of Othon's descendants appeared in Greece at one time or another. A grandson named John thus paid a visit to Greece in 1259, and John's brother Othon was in Athens in 1265; a great-grandson, Gautier, was precentor of the Parthenon in 1292; a relative, Pierre de la Roche, became, long before this,

castellan of the Acropolis (1230–1233?); and a nephew named William became through his marriage into the family of the Valaincourt, lord of Veligosti and Damala (1259–1264).⁶⁷

Younger sons of the de la Roche, according to the usual practice of noble families, often entered the Church, but even in Athens a de la Roche might well fail to get the ecclesiastical office he wanted. Thus about the beginning of the year 1268 the canons of Athens assembled in the Parthenon, and elected one Guillaume de la Roche, who had taken only minor orders, to the exalted office of archbishop. Pope Clement IV, however, refused to accept the nomination, although he did appoint Guillaume procurator of the Athenian church, which he hoped might profit "from the industry and solicitude of your administration."⁶⁸ Clement, like other popes, looked askance at capitular elections, but having quashed the canons' nomination, a pope would often proceed on his own to appoint the same candidate. In this case Clement was not merely making a point of his prerogative, and Guillaume never became the archbishop of Athens. Why he was unacceptable to the Curia Romana, we do not know. We have little information concerning the lesser members of the de la Roche family.

From the early years of their establishment in Greece Othon de la Roche had shared Thebes with his nephew Guy (1210–1211), to whom he later surrendered all his Greek dominions (1225), and who was to become, it is alleged, the first duke of Athens (1260). Some time after the grant of one-half of Thebes had been made to Guy de la Roche, his sister Bonne received the other half, which she brought to her second husband, Bela of S. Omer, apparently in the 1230's. Bela of S. Omer became the father of three sons distinguished in the thirteenth-century history of continental Greece and the Morea.⁶⁹ The sister of the first Othon de la

⁶⁴ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 251, dated 8 February, 1224, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 21, p. 34: "... ad defensionem predicti regni et specialiter castri Bondovitie intendens viriliter et potenter . . ."; *Regesta Hon. III*, II, no. 4758, p. 207, and cf. no. 5464, p. 333, dated 6 May, 1225. The "castle of Boudonitza," a little south of Thermopylae, was on the heights of ancient Pharygai.

⁶⁵ Hon. III, an. IX, ep. 85, in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 22, pp. 35–36; *Regesta*, II, no. 5202, p. 286, "datum Laterani nonis Decembris anno nono," and misdated *non. Septemb[ris]* by a slip of the pen in Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1224, no. 26, vol. XX (Lucca, 1747), p. 537. The pope promised assistance from the Marquis Guglielmo IV of Montferrat and the Latin Emperor Robert, who had received papal subsidies to help them hold Thessalonica.

⁶⁶ Hon. III, an. IX, ep. 295, in *Regesta*, II, no. 5304, p. 304.

⁶⁷ Cf. J. B. Guillaume, *Hist. des Sires de Salins*, I (1757), 67, 83; Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes* (1873), geneal. tables, pp. 472 (on Veligosti), 473; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 66. As always, the genealogical tables given in Hopf's *Chron. gréco-romanes* are to be used with extreme caution.

⁶⁸ Léopold Delisle, "... Recueils épistolaires de Bérard de Naples," in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXVII, pt. 2 (Paris, 1879), 140–41, who mistakenly calls Guillaume "de la Rochette" (cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 115, note, with the date of appointment to the procuratorship).

⁶⁹ Cf. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes*, p. 477, and esp. Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 275 (repr. 1960, I,

Roche, Sibylle, had married Jacques de Cicon, and was the mother of Othon de Cicon, who later became baron of Carystus (1250–1263?), and appears to have married Agnese, sister or half-sister of the redoubtable conquerors Geremia and Andrea Ghisi.⁷⁰

Othon de la Roche had spent some twenty years in Athens from that October or November day of 1204 when his Burgundian knights had been allowed by Boniface of Montferrat to occupy the city. Now Othon was tired of the castles on the Cadmea and the Acropolis, and returned to his home in Burgundy with his wife and sons, leaving the Athenian lordship to his nephew, Guy de la Roche, who had long possessed, as we have seen, one-half the city of Thebes.⁷¹ Almost to the close of his long residence in Greece, Othon lived in the dark shadows of ecclesiastical censure. In his own domain he seems to have been popular, and the mother and sisters of the Greek scholar and ecclesiastic George Bardanes "Atticus" lived in Athens under Othon without experiencing, it would appear, any physical or material harm from the Latins.⁷² Bardanes himself left the exile he was sharing with his friend and teacher the Metropolitan Michael, to return to Athens, whither Michael's nephew had also gone back to live.⁷³ Michael wrote his friend Demetrius Macrembolites that he did not know "whether he was residing at Athens or at Chalcis in Euboea, or at Thebes in Boeotia,"⁷⁴ although

shortly afterwards Michael learned that his friend Demetrius was in Athens.⁷⁵ Other examples of Greeks living in peace and quiet in the Athenian lordship of Othon de la Roche could easily be cited from the interesting letters of Michael Choniates, but the few we have chosen may suffice to illustrate the fact that Othon's rule could not have been a harsh one.

Othon de la Roche was especially popular with the Cistercians, to whom he had given Daphni, and to whose abbey of Bellevaux in Franche-Comté, object of many a pious donation by his family, his devotion did not relax even after long residence in Greece. Throughout the fourth decade of the century the Cistercians in Daphni found their claim to the town of Liconia (*casale de Liconia*) challenged by an important knight of Negroponte, Alberto Boceranni, guardian of his nieces, Floretta and Vermilia, and although consideration of the facts in the Curia Romana brought forth papal letters to various ecclesiastics in Greece to see that the monks of Daphni were put in possession of the town of Liconia and its appurtenances, the case dragged on interminably through the courts, both in Rome and in Greece.⁷⁶ The case was hard fought, doubtless because revenues estimated at ten thousand hyperperi were at stake.⁷⁷ The Cistercians of Daphni continued their affiliation with the house at Bellevaux, and Daphni still appears, for example, in association with Bellevaux in 1276 in the statutes of the chapter general of the Cistercian Order.⁷⁸ It is small wonder, therefore, that we should find the abbot and monks of Daphni, in the last years of the lord Othon in Greece, disregarding an interdict laid upon his lands in Attica and Boeotia by the cardinal legate Giovanni Colonna

209). Nicholas of S. Omer, who is said to have arrived in Greece in 1208 at the earliest, was the father of Bela, whose mother was a Hungarian princess. The S. Omer were a cadet branch of the Fauquembergue, castellans of the Flemish town of S. Omer (Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 147–49, and *L'Empire latin* [1949], pp. 119, 177).

⁷⁰ Cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel, 1207–1390," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), 158–61, sweeping aside the unsupported conjectures of Hopf, and *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel*, Florence, 1975, pp. 34, 35, 363.

⁷¹ Cf. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes*, p. 473. The last papal letter addressed to Othon de la Roche is dated 12 February, 1225, and seeks to encourage him and Prince Geoffrey of Achaea amid the gloom which descended upon the Latin barons in Greece after the fall of the kingdom of Thessalonica (Hon. III, an. IX, ep. 295, in Pressutti, *Regesta*, II [1895], no. 5304, p. 304). Cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 275 (repr. 1960, I, 209).

⁷² Cf. Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 141, 3 (Lampros, II, 284).

⁷³ Mich. Chon., *Epp.* 132, 140 (Lampros, II, 267–8, 282). On the later career of Bardanes, see Johannes M. Hoeck and R. J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole*, Ettal, 1965, *passim*.

⁷⁴ Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 145, 1 (Lampros, II, 292).

⁷⁵ Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 150, 2 (Lampros, II, 301): "Ἐχουσι γάρ σε καὶ πάλιν Ἀθῆναι, τὸ πατρίον καὶ φίλον ἔδαφος. . ."

⁷⁶ Lucien Auvray, ed., *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (Paris, 1907), nos. 2671 (12 July, 1235, already an old case) and 3214 (27 June, 1236); nos. 3583 (also in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 24, pp. 37–38, dated 30 March, 1237) and 4390 (*ibid.*, doc. 26, pp. 40–42, dated 26 May, 1238); and *Reg. Grég. IX*, fasc. 12 (Paris, 1910), nos. 5204 (1 June, 1240) and 6085 (8 July, 1241, the case still far from being settled).

⁷⁷ *Reg. Grég. IX*, II, no. 4390, col. 1046; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 26, p. 42, dated 26 May, 1238.

⁷⁸ Edm. Martène and Ursin Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, IV (Paris, 1717), col. 1453: ". . . abbatia de Dalphino in partibus Graeciae . . ." and see Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "The Cistercians in the Latin Empire . . .," *Traditio*, XIV (1958), 82, 97 ff., 111 ff., who (as noted above, Chapter 3, note 10) incorrectly identifies papal references to the *dominicum templum Athenarum* with the Templars.

of S. Praxedis, and being reprimanded therefor by the pope, who directed the bishop and archdeacon of Negroponte to take care that they should mend their ways, not entrusting the charge, for obvious reasons, to the archbishop of Athens.⁷⁹ Perhaps the monks were also moved by self-preservation, for life in the Athenian lordship was still fraught with danger. Othon de la Roche was near at hand, and the pope was far away. Pirates swarmed in the Saronic and Corinthian Gulfs under the Franks no less than in the time of Michael Choniates, and a letter of 1232, from the Despot Manuel Ducas to the Nicene Patriarch Germanus, describes the sail in Corinthian waters through the straits of Naupactus as a "voyage to Acheron" (τὸ εἰς Ἀχέροντα καταπλεύσαι).⁸⁰ On 9 October, 1223, Pope Honorius III had allowed the archbishop of Athens, at the latter's request, to absolve and impose a proper penance upon such pirates as wished to return to the Church; these pirates were Latins, popularly known as Capellecti, and we suspect that there were few willing to give up their exciting and lucrative profession to walk in the paths of righteousness.⁸¹ But the de la Roche knew more dangers than those presented by the pirates, and a generation later (in 1244) Guy de la Roche, then lord of Athens, found that Greek monks living in his domain served as a "fifth column," revealing secrets to their fellow Greeks of Epirus or Nicaea.⁸²

The interest of the papacy extended quite beyond the affairs of the Latin hierarchy and the baronage in Greece. The popes protected the Greeks themselves against exploitation by the Latin clergy even when such protection ran contrary to Latin custom. Thus at the time of the conquest in 1204 the natives of Attica, *tam nobiles quam ignobiles*, had married as they chose, rendering to the Greek archdeacon of the Athenian church and to his Latin successor a single hen and a loaf of bread and nothing else. But in the time of Pope Gregory IX the Latin archdeacon of Athens would not allow a marriage to take

place without the guarantee of a money payment. This had caused great offense to the Greeks, who naturally sought to escape from the Latin obedience. On 23 February, 1233, Gregory directed the Latin archbishop, the cantor, and a canon of Corinth to force the archdeacon of Athens to restore whatever he had thus extorted from the Greeks and to make direct representations on his own behalf at the Apostolic See.⁸³

By the fourth decade of the thirteenth century the Gregorian reform had worn thin, but the registers of the ninth Gregory reveal the Church to be in an excellent state of health in the West. Troubles were soon to come, however, and despite all the good the mendicants were to do, they would also do much harm to ecclesiastical morality. In the meantime the Latin secular clergy in Greece, *in partibus schismaticorum existentes*, found it easy to loosen the bonds of rectitude even at the episcopal level. According to the report, for example, of the archdeacon and the *maior ac sanior pars* of the cathedral chapter of Cephalonia, the bishop of the island see had not bothered to baptize children more than eight times in thirty years, and consequently many youngsters had died without receiving the rite at all. At any rate his excellency appears not to have added hypocrisy to his other failings, because he brought up his own bastards as though they were legitimate, and he even made simoniacal appointments of excommunicated Greek priests to canonries in the cathedral chapter of Cephalonia.⁸⁴ The Greek churches and monasteries had a hard time, but on occasion some Greek with more money than most of his co-religionists did something for them, as we learn from a stele which has stood for centuries at Stavros, where the eastward road from Athens goes on to Marathon and swerves south to Porto Rafti. It lies below the monastery of S. John the Hunter, on the saddle of Mount Hymettus. The stele bears a metrical inscription dated 1238 asking the traveler to pray for the soul of one "Neophytus by name, a servant of the Lord," who

⁷⁹ Hon. III, an. VI, ep. 351, in Pressutti, *Regesta*, II, no. 3904, p. 59, dated 28 March, 1222.

⁸⁰ Fr. Miklosich and Jos. Müller, eds., *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, III (Vienna, 1865), doc. XIII, p. 61, cited by Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, p. 67.

⁸¹ Hon. III, an. VIII, ep. 61 (*Regesta*, II, no. 4528, p. 167): ". . . piratae, qui Capellecti vulgariter nuncupantur. . . ."

⁸² Élie Berger, ed., *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, I (Paris, 1884), no. 657, pp. 112-13, dated 29 April, 1244: ". . . quod quidam monachi Greci . . . secreta sepe Grecis revelant. . . ."

⁸³ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I (Paris, 1896), no. 1109, cols. 636-37, and Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 23, p. 36. On Latin ecclesiastical administration in Greece and Constantinople at this time, cf. Auvray, I, nos. 1175, 1184, 1235, 1502, 1638, 1704, 1746, 2049, and 2196, docs. not referred to elsewhere in this study, and cf. also, *ibid.*, II (1907), nos. 2530, 3262, 3382, 3618, 3878, 4022, 4196, 4207 ff.

⁸⁴ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, III (1908), no. 4795, cols. 3-4, dated 23 March, 1239.

had built or improved the roadway going up to the monastery.⁸⁵

The sources make clear that Latins and Greeks lived together in Athens and Thebes with some uneasiness. In an earlier chapter we noted two important references in letters of Pope Gregory IX, dated 12 July, 1235, and 27 June, 1236, to "the frequent attacks upon and devastation of the city of Thebes," which had often been ravaged by the Greeks.⁸⁶ But if soldiers will fight, merchants will trade, and Thebes was still a center for the manufacture of silk cloth. The text has survived of an interesting commercial agreement, dated at Thebes on 24 December, 1240, between Riccio di S. Donato, the Genoese consul resident in Thebes, and the lord Guy I de la Roche of Athens. The latter expresses the greatest esteem for the Genoese Republic, whose citizens can come into his domain by land or sea or, *quod Deus advertat*, even by shipwreck, with complete safety and security, so far as he is concerned, in their goods and persons, and with freedom from the customary tolls and exactions. However, there is the restriction "that on silk cloths woven or made in our land by the Genoese, or for them, the Genoese are themselves bound to pay us that which is customarily demanded and had of others." The Genoese are granted their own court and consul, before whom members of the Genoese community should be justiciable, except in cases of homicide, theft, "and the violent seizure of women." In both Athens and Thebes the Genoese are to have a consular house, or a community center, together with an open square (*campus*), to be assigned by the lord of Athens where he shall choose and Genoese need require. For these concessions both the consul and the other Genoese in the Athenian lordship are to swear to help preserve the properties, persons,

and lands both of Guy de la Roche and of his people.⁸⁷

The even tenor of Guy de la Roche's rule over Attica, Boeotia, and the Megarid was of course interrupted by his involvement, against Prince William of Achaea, in the war of the Euboeote succession. After defeating Guy at Mount Karydi (in 1258) William harried the plains of Attica and Boeotia with fire and sword.⁸⁸ He plundered to the very walls of Thebes, as the *Chronicle of the Morea* informs us, and undoubtedly ecclesiastical estates suffered along with all the rest. But William was dissuaded from attacking Thebes by the metropolitan and some of his own nobles.⁸⁹ Guy swore

⁸⁵ *Liber iurium reipublicae genuensis*, I (Turin, 1854), doc. DCCLVII, cols. 992–93 (in the *Historiae patriae monumenta edita iussu R. Caroli Alberti*, VII): "... eo salvo quod de pannis sericis ab eisdem Ianuensibus vel pro eis in terra nostra textis seu compositis, ipsi Ianuenses nobis solvere teneantur id quod ab aliis exigi solitum est et haberi. Concedimus etiam eis ut curiam propriam et suum consulem eis habere liceat. . . ." Cf. Hopf, Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 276 (repr. 1960, I, 210); W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I (Leipzig, 1885; repr. Amsterdam, 1967), 293. On 27 September, 1262, Pope Urban IV wrote the archbishops of Athens and Thebes, the bishop of Argos (all three places under Guy I of Athens), and five other members of the hierarchy in Greece, requesting each to purchase and send to him "quattuor exameta . . . bene texta et tinta, viridis, violacei, rubei, bene coccati et albi colorum" (Jean Guiraud, ed., *Les Registres d'Urban IV [1261–1264]*, I [Paris, 1901], no. 67, p. 17, and cf. no. 66, dated 6 August, 1262), showing that Greek silks were still in demand in Italy for ecclesiastical vestments: the pope requests of each recipient of his letters four pieces of silk cloth, well woven and dyed green, purple, red, and white.

⁸⁶ Marino Sanudo, *Istoria del regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes* (1873), p. 105: "Finalmente il principe fatto un gran sforzo di gente, andò per gir a Attene, e il signor della Roccia li andò in contro con la sua gente, e al passo del Moscro detto Cariddi fecero conflitto, e il duca fù rotto, e fugato. Il principe venuto vincitore, e signore de la campagna, scorre tutto il piano del duca insino in Attene, depredando e bruggiando il tutto." Cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 279 (repr. 1960, I, 213); Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 105–6; Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 220–21; and see above, p. 80.

⁸⁷ *Greek Chron. of Morea*, ed. John Schmitt (London, 1904), vv. 3309–12, pp. 220, 221. With Guy de la Roche in Thebes were Geoffrey of Briell, lord of Karytaina; the brothers S. Omer; Guy's own three brothers; Thomas II of Salona; the triarchs of Negroponte; and Ubertino Pallavicini, the margrave of Boudonitza (*ibid.*, vv. 3288–95). The Moreote chronicler tells the story of the war with much picturesque detail, his sympathies being all on William's side (vv. 3173–3331). The verses in the last edition of the Greek chronicle by P. P. Kalonaros, Athens, 1940, are numbered as in Schmitt's edition, on which Kalonaros largely depends for his text.

⁸⁸ *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, IV (Berlin, 1856–59), no. 8752, p. 345, on which see D. G. Kampouroglous, *History of the Athenians* (in Greek), 3 vols., Athens, 1889–96, II, 213–15, and cf. Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, p. 93. The English traveler Francis Vernon saw the stele in its accustomed place, and copied the inscription into his journal on 10 November, 1675, a rather poor transcription (Royal Society, Burlington House, Vernon MS. 73, p. 36). He copied the date as A.M. 6740 (=A.D. 1232); it apparently should be A.M. 6746 (=A.D. 1238). I am grateful to my colleague, Professor B. D. Meritt, for the loan of a photocopy of the Vernon MS. Cf., above, p. 65.

⁸⁹ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), nos. 2671 and 3214, cols. 108 and 421.

never again to take up arms against William, and promised to come before the High Court of Achaea to answer charges and to accept the penalty of bearing arms against his alleged suzerain. The court sat at Nikli, whither Guy came attended by Thomas II, lord of Salona, and numerous other knights. Instead of declaring Guy to have broken the fealty he owed the prince, and therefore to have forfeited the lands he held of him, as William apparently expected, the assembled lieges decided that they were not Guy's peers, and so requested that his case be referred for judgment to King Louis IX of France, arbiter in his day of so many disputes of high import over politics and property. Guy was the vassal of Prince William for Argos, Nauplia, and half of Thebes, but the Athenian lordship was a hereditary possession, won by the sword, held by right of conquest, wherein Guy de la Roche was sovereign. Peace was restored at Nikli, and knights jousted in the plain in celebration thereof.

Guy returned with his knights and followers to Thebes, where he spent the winter preparing for the long journey that lay before him. In March, 1259, leaving his younger brother Othon as bailie of the lordship of Athens,⁹⁰ he set out with numerous attendants in two galleys which were awaiting him in the Theban port of Livadostro. He sailed to Brindisi, whence he was to go by land to Paris, where Louis IX and a French court would pass judgment on him.⁹¹ According to the Greek *Chronicle*, Guy went immediately to the king, who received him with great honor at the feast of Pentecost, which in 1259 fell on 1 June.⁹²

An emissary of Prince William, who had accompanied Guy all the way, gave King Louis a letter in which William explained the nature of Guy's offense and the conditions under which he had come to Paris to seek the royal judgment. The king summoned "all the high men of France

and the wisest clerks he had," and before them a statement of the case was made, of why and how the prince of Achaea had sent the lord of Athens, who was his vassal, to Paris to be adjudged and punished for having taken up arms against him and having done him battle in the field. There was debate among those high and noble men of France and those good clerks, whom the chronicler assures us to have been of great understanding. At last the parliament reached a unanimous decision: If Guy de la Roche had done homage to the prince and had then fought against him as an enemy, he would have merited the forfeiture of whatever he held of the prince; but since Guy had never done homage to William of Villehardouin, nor had his predecessors, one could not call William the suzerain of the lord of Athens (*on ne porroit dire que il fust son lige seignor*). It was, therefore, decided that in sending Guy to France, "a land so far from Romania," the prince of Achaea had already received adequate satisfaction, for the offense committed against him by Guy, in the expense and travail the latter had undergone to get to Paris. There cannot be many instances in the history of France in which Frenchmen have declared that a journey to Paris and a sojourn in that fair city was a punishment. Guy solemnly thanked the king and the barons; kissed the king's feet; and requested letters to be duly sealed in testimony of his appearance before the royal court and of the decision of that court. When the letters had been prepared and delivered to the lord of Athens, the king summoned him, and said: "Sire de la Roche, you have come to Paris from a land so far away as Romania. It is right and proper that you should not depart from my court without receiving some favor of me, and therefore I grant you willingly what you ask, at all times saving my crown and my honor." Guy answered that he wished he might be called, from that day forth, the Duke of Athens, for this land had of old been a duchy, and its lord had been called the Duke of Athens (which was doubtless so in popular parlance), and thus Louis granted Guy's request, allegedly creating the first medieval Duke of Athens.⁹³ The account in the Moreote Chronicles

⁹⁰ *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio (1885), par. 234, p. 52: "... et dexó [Guy] á micer Otho de la Rocia, su hermano, governador de toda la tierra suya."

⁹¹ *Greek Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 3313-77, pp. 220-24; *Chron. de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 232-44, pp. 84-88; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 223-34, pp. 50-52, where Guy de la Roche is called William; *Cronaca di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.* p. 439-40.

⁹² *Greek Chron. of Morea*, vv. 3373-84. The chronology seems quite clear, but Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 284 (repr. 1960, I, 218), and Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), pp. 106-7, erroneously place Louis's reception of Guy after the latter's sojourn in Burgundy in February, 1260.

⁹³ *Chron. de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 245-53, pp. 88-92; *Greek Chron. of Morea*, ed. Schmitt, vv. 3385-3463, pp. 224-30; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, par. 293, p. 65; and cf. the *Cron. di Morea*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, p. 440. Note also, for what they may be worth, the fanciful observations of Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, VII, 5 (Bonn,

is most unlikely. The lords of the Acropolis and Cadmea were, however, officially known from about 1280 as the dukes of Athens, a title borne by Theseus in the works of Dante and Boccaccio, Chaucer and Shakespeare.

On his return journey Guy spent some time in Burgundy, where he found relatives and friends, and probably some old retainers of his house whom he had not seen for more than fifty years. In February, 1260, he borrowed 2,000 *livres tournois* from Duke Hugh IV "for the needs of our land."⁹⁴ It was while he was in France or Burgundy, according to Sanudo, that Guy met Hugh de Brienne, the count of Lecce, who years later

(in 1277) was to marry Isabelle de la Roche, Guy's daughter, then widowed by the death of her first husband, the warrior Geoffrey of Karytaina (d. 1275). Hugh de Brienne and Isabelle were to be the parents of Gautier I (V) de Brienne, also count of Lecce and the last French duke of Athens (1309–1311).⁹⁵

In the meantime Prince William of Achaia had met disaster in the battle of Pelagonia (in the fall of 1259), as we have seen in an earlier chapter, and while Guy's own position was thus strengthened by the defeat and humiliation of his opponent, obviously the Latin establishment in Greece was severely shaken. The news of Pelagonia brought Guy I de la Roche home in the spring of 1260, apparently in some haste, and until the release of Prince William of Villehardouin from his Byzantine imprisonment, Guy was the mainstay of the Latin states in Greece. He died in 1263, and was followed by his elder son John (1263–1280), who became closely connected with the Ducae of Epirus, who were hardly more reconciled to the Emperor Michael VIII's victory at Pelagonia than were the discomfited Latins. In 1264, however, the emperor was finally able to make what seemed like a more or less lasting peace with the adventurous Epirotes. Nicephorus, son of the Despot Michael II Ducas, was married to the emperor's niece Anna Palaeologina. About 1267 the Despot Michael II died, and was succeeded by his two sons. Nicephorus inherited the lands of the despotate, Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia, together with the island of Leukas. Michael's bastard son John, whose betrayal of his father's allies had allegedly caused the Latin disaster at Pelagonia, received Thessaly (the medieval *Blachia*) with the so-called duchy of Neopatras (the modern Hypate), over which he was to rule until his death in 1295. The Emperor Michael found John Ducas, whom the Latins called the "duke" of Neopatras (from his family name Ducas), especially difficult to get along with, but once more he had recourse to matrimony to solve his problem, and married off his nephew Andronicus Tarchaneiotes to one of John's daughters. John himself received the title of sebastocrator, and now like his brother Nicephorus two or three years before, he took

I, 239), on the title Duke of Athens. The Greeks called Othon de la Roche and his successor Guy the "great lord" (*megas kyr*), a title which appears constantly in the Greek chronicle, although in a letter dated 14 July, 1208, Pope Innocent III (an. XI, ep. 121 [PL 215, 1435B]) does call Othon the "duke of Athens" (*dux Athenarum*), but as observed above (note 38), this seems to be the only employment of the title in the papal correspondence of the period.

Jean Longnon has more than once emphasized that the account, in the *Chronicle of the Morea*, of Louis's granting Guy I de la Roche the title Duke of Athens "is not in accord with the documents." In official acts neither Othon nor Guy ever used this title, which contemporaries sometimes gave them unofficially. There is still no apparent change of title from 1259–1260, but only from about 1280, upon the accession to the ducal throne of William I, Guy's younger son and second successor (1280–1287), suggesting that official recognition of the title may have come from Louis's brother, Charles of Anjou, who was, after 1267, suzerain of the lords of Athens and princes of Achaia (cf. "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, pp. 90–91, and *L'Empire latin* [1949], pp. 222–23, 236–37, 257–58). The coins are important in this connection. A few early coins of Guy I bear the legends *Dns. Athen.* (*Dominus Athenarum*) and *Theb. Civi.* (*Thebarum Civis*); coins of William I and his successors, however, bear the legends *Dux Atenes* and *Thebe Civis*; there are numerous variations in the form: *Dux Atenes*, *Dux Actenar'*, *Dux Ath'*, *Thebe Civis*, *Tebes Civis*, *Thebani Civis*, *Tebar' Civis*, *Theba' Civis*; the coins of the later de la Roche are fairly numerous (see Gustav Schlumberger, *Numismatique de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1878, pp. 337–40, and pl. XII, nos. 30–32). The evidence of the seals is not helpful (G. Schlumberger, F. Chalandon, and A. Blanchet, *Sigillographie de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1943, pp. 195–96).

⁹⁴ Chas. Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon, vol. I (Paris, 1826), doc. XVII, pp. 436–37; Buchon, *Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, II (Paris, 1845), 385–86: ". . . nos por les besoignes de nostre terre avons emprunté et receu en deniers nombrés dou noble baron Hugon, duc de Bourgoigne, dus mile livres de tornois. . . ." He uses the title Lord of Athens: "Nos Guis de la Roche, sire d'Athines . . ." (Du Cange-Buchon, *Hist.*, I, docs. XVII–XVIII, pp. 436, 437; Buchon, *Recherches historiques*, II, 385, 386, docs. dated February, 1259, which is 1260, new style, and cf. Longnon, "Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée," *Journal des Savants*, 1946, p. 90).

⁹⁵ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 106, 473, and on Geoffrey of Briel, lord of Karytaina, note Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 199, 246. Anna called herself Cantacuzena (Nicol, *Family of Kantakouzenos* [1968], no. 16, pp. 20–24).

or renewed an oath of allegiance to the Emperor Michael.⁹⁶

Marriage into the imperial family, however, did not lessen the Sebastocrator John Ducas's bellicosity, and in 1270 after "breaking his word many times," says Nicephorus Gregoras, "he ravaged the territory of the Romans" [meaning of course the Byzantines]. The indignant emperor sent his brother, the Despot John Palaeologus, the victor at Pelagonia, against him in 1271; the despot's army was supported by a large fleet; and for a while it looked as though John Ducas's last hour had come as the Byzantine commander's Cuman mercenaries plundered Thessaly. But John Ducas took refuge in his hilltop fortress at Neopatras, and in desperation cast about for an ally. Hitting upon an audacious plan, when Neopatras was put under siege, he had himself let down from the high walls with a rope, and in tattered clothes, his face concealed by a dark cloak, he made his way through the Byzantine camp disguised as a groom, holding a rein in his hand and raucously inquiring whether anyone had seen a stray horse. No one had, and John Ducas got through the enemy lines safely. Dawn found him on the way to Thebes. He went by back roads, and reached his destination without further mishap. His arrival caused astonishment at Thebes, for not even the Neopatrenses knew that he had left their midst. He apparently received a warm welcome from John de la Roche, known to his people, says Pachymeres, as *Syr Ioannes*. John Ducas begged the lord of Thebes and Athens for help against the Byzantine invaders, and offered him the hand of his daughter Helena

as the basis of an alliance. John de la Roche, who suffered severely from gout (*podagra*), declined the young lady's hand; he did propose, however, that she be given to his more robust younger brother and heir, William, lord of Livadia. Later on, the marriage took place. In the meantime other matters were more pressing.⁹⁷

The lord of Athens got together some three hundred or more knights and marched immediately into the valley of the river Spercheus, then called the Ellada, where his slender force was strengthened by such troops as John Ducas had been able to assemble. From a height near Neopatras, John de la Roche looked down upon the opposing army, and John Ducas pointed out its enormous size, allegedly 30,000 mounted men, *trenta mila a cavallo*, but John de la Roche replied, in Greek, with a phrase from Herodotus, which had become a proverb, that "there were a lot of people there, but few men" (*πολὺς λαός, ὀλίγοι ἄνθρωποι*). The appearance of the Frankish knights was a surprise. It was also a success. The siege of Neopatras had achieved nothing. Rumors were quickly rife in the Byzantine army, and various groups had begun to flee even before they saw the enemy; some said that Prince William of Achaea was coming; others said it was the duke of Athens, and these were right. Soon the whole army was in disordered retreat, heading for the coast, where the imperial fleet was known to be stationed. John Palaeologus withdrew in haste with his defeated forces, "the few having conquered the many," and under cover of the darkening night the frightened troops saved their lives, those who resisted being killed. Pachymeres paints a dismal picture of the Byzantine defeat.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ That both the Sebastocrator John and the Despot Nicephorus took oaths of allegiance to the Emperor Michael VIII (. . . *sacramentum* . . . *fidelitatis et ligii homagii multototiens prestiterunt*) appears from the statement of the case by the Byzantine protonotary Ogerius (Jules Gay and Suzanne Vitte, eds., *Les Registres de Nicolas III* [1277-1280], 5 fascs., Paris, 1898-1938, no. 384, p. 135a, and R. J. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, Rome, 1970, par. 5, p. 552), but one may doubt whether Ogerius is an entirely objective and trustworthy source. Cf. Geo. Pachymeres, *De Michaelae Palaeologo*, IV, 26 (Bonn, I, 307-9); and Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.* IV, 9, 1 (Bonn, I, 109-10). John Ducas received the title of sebastocrator and his daughter married Andronicus Tarchaneiotis about 1267 (Loenertz, *op. cit.*, reg. no. 4, p. 557), the events being incorrectly dated in Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, pt. 3 (1932), no. 1976, p. 57. The marriage seems to have taken place shortly after the Despot Michael II's death, on which see above, Chapter 3, note 62.

⁹⁷ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, IV, 30-31 (Bonn, I, 324-28); Gregoras, IV, 9, 2-5 (Bonn, I, 111-14). For the date 1271 see the chronological table in the Jesuit scholar Pierre Poussines's remarkable notes on the text of Pachymeres, I, 758, to which Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, p. 558, calls attention. According to Pachymeres, *loc. cit.* (Bonn, I, 324), in the Byzantine army and fleet together there were said to be 40,000 men.

⁹⁸ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, IV, 31 (Bonn, I, 328-31), who says there were about 300 Frankish knights in the force that broke the siege of Neopatras (*ibid.*, p. 328, line 14, and p. 330, l. 1); Gregoras, IV, 9, 6-7 (Bonn, I, 114-16), who puts the number at 500 (*ibid.*, p. 114, ll. 21-22); Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 120-21: "Il duca [Miser Zuanne della Rocca, duca d'Attene] veduto senza mirar ben detto essercito, disse in greco: 'Poli laos, oligo atropi,' cioè grande essercito e pochi vuomini." Cf. Herodotus, VII, 210, and Diogenes Laertius,

The broken army of John Palaeologus retreated northward toward the town of Demetrias, at the head of the Gulf of Volos (or Halmyros), where it might draw both provisions and strength from the Byzantine fleet. The triarchs and the Venetians on Negroponte, moved with excitement and jealousy when they learned of the success of the lords of Athens and Neopatras, decided to emulate on the sea the victory which had just been secured on land. They armed twelve galleys and transports (*galee e tarrette*) and fifty other ships with oars, and launched an ill-planned attack upon the imperial armada of (it was said) eighty galleys anchored off the harbor of Demetrias. The chosen captain of the Latin galleys was Messer Filippo Sanudo, son of Leone Sanudo, onetime bailie of Negroponte (1252–1254); the historian Marino Sanudo reports that Leone had left a good name behind him in that important office, but that the inexperienced son now mismanaged his command badly. The force of the Latin attack, however, was such as to drive back and crowd together many of the Byzantine galleys, the wind carrying some of them upon the shore. But the Byzantine naval commander was equal to the emergency, and the galleys were pushed offshore. Men-at-arms were dismounted, and hastily sent on board the Greek vessels, whereupon a counter-attack was launched upon the Latin fleet, says Sanudo, "by men skilled in warfare, and fresh, and [the Latins] were easily defeated." The Venetian and Lombard losses were very grave. Among others, Guglielmo da Verona, whom Sanudo incorrectly identifies as the marshal of the Morea, was killed. Sanudo lists an additional eight important persons who were captured, including the captain, Filippo Sanudo himself, and Francesco da Verona, father of that Boniface of Verona who was to play so conspicuous a part in the Euboeote and Athenian history of the next generation.⁹⁹ Giberto II da Verona, lord of the southern

"third" of Negroponte, made good his escape on a light-armed vessel, and organized the defense of Negroponte with some others who had also fled the disaster. Even so the Greeks almost succeeded in taking the city. The Venetian colony, however, headed by their bailie, much assisted by an Athenian force which John de la Roche sent over the black bridge to help them, warded off the Greek attacks, and saved the city for its Venetian and Lombard owners. The lord of Athens thus rendered a signal service to the cause of Latin rule in Greece,¹⁰⁰ and he had rendered also no small service to John Ducas of Neopatras, whose restive spirit seems to have been but little chastened by the dangers he had faced. In any event John Ducas now gave his daughter to William de la Roche, together with a very substantial dowry, perhaps the price of Athenian aid against the Palaeologi, and so William, already the lord of Livadia, received the towns of Gravia, Siderocastron, and Zeitounion (Gitone), the modern Lamia.¹⁰¹ It was a profitable marriage. The Athenian lordship now extended north into Thessaly, encircling the margraviate of Boudonitza, and approaching even Neopatras, which in the following century would itself become a Latin duchy and be ruled by a Catalan vicar-general from the capital city of Thebes.

Although the Emperor Michael VIII found a bulwark against Angevin attack in the ecclesiastical union of Lyon in 1274, as we know well, he had to admit papal supremacy and accept the *filioque* clause,¹⁰² which once more exposed him to the barbs of his Greek enemies, among whom the Sebastocrator John Ducas of Neopatras and his brother the Despot Nicephorus of Arta occupied a most prominent place. Immediately after the formal ratification of the decree of union in April, 1277, by Michael VIII, his son Andronicus [II], the Patriarch John XI Beccus, and the Holy Synod in Constantinople, Michael sent an embassy to the Ducae admonishing them also to submit to Rome. The admonition was a canonical necessity; if they failed to heed it, they would incur excommunication. They were

VI, 40. Only Pachymeres (1242–1310?) was contemporary with the events he describes; Gregoras (1291?–1360) shows evidences of having read Pachymeres closely, but introduces gratuitous changes in the narrative. Sanudo (1270–1337) gives the historical tradition as it was preserved in Negroponte and the Archipelago.

⁹⁹Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 121–22; Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, IV, 31–32 (Bonn, I, 331–35), who says that the Latins had about thirty ships; Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, IV, 10, 1–4 (Bonn, I, 117–20); R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers de Négrepont," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), reg. no. 76, pp. 257–58.

¹⁰⁰Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 122.

¹⁰¹Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 136.

¹⁰²Cf. Michael VIII's profession of Catholic faith (of April, 1277), in Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 228, p. 82a: "Credimus etiam Spiritum Sanctum plenum et perfectum verumque Deum ex Patre et Filio procedentem coequalem et coes[us]entialem et coomnipotentem et coeternum per omnia Patri et Filio."

of course excommunicated, but when Michael VIII tried to proceed against them, the treason of anti-unionist administrators along the Thesalian border allowed, indeed encouraged, the energetic John Ducas to seize "certain castles" in imperial territory.¹⁰³ Neopatras became the rallying ground of Michael VIII's adversaries, and the reader will recall that John Ducas held an anti-unionist council late in the year 1276, at which dissident divines excommunicated the pope, the emperor, and the Byzantine patriarch. The sole source of our knowledge of this council is the memorial prepared by the imperial interpreter and protonotary Ogerius in the late spring or early summer of 1278. Michael VIII, as we have seen, gave this memorial to the papal emissaries Marco and Marchetto to take back to the Curia Romana to explain why he was finding it most inexpedient to force every aspect of his commitment to church union upon the Greeks, for his religious stance had caused terrible dissension in his family as well as in the military administration along the Thesalian border, where John Ducas had become a serious menace.¹⁰⁴ Michael was especially exasperated by the unsavory fact that while he was trying to secure the subjection of the Greek to the Latin Church, the Latins in Thebes and Athens, Negroponte and the Morea had never ceased to aid and abet his adversaries, "namely those apostates Nicephorus and the bastard [John Ducas]." Finally Michael sent some ships and men against the triarchs and Venetians of Negroponte, as Ogerius informed the Curia Romana, and divine justice granted his forces a notable victory over the larger numbers of the Latin blasphemers.¹⁰⁵

The Byzantine attack upon Negroponte to which Ogerius refers is certainly that made in 1276 when Michael VIII sent a fleet with some land forces against the triarchs and the Venetians. The fleet arrived for action in northern Euboeote waters, under the vigorous command of one Licario, whose hostility to his fellow Latins was to be their undoing. Years before, Licario's forebears had come to Negro-

ponte from Vicenza, and Licario's first appearance in the pages of Sanudo's history is as a simple knight of the city of Carystus, *un cavallier della città di Caristo detto Miser Licario*, serving in the following of Giberto II da Verona, proud triarch of Negroponte. Living in Giberto's household was his sister, Madonna Felisa, widow of the triarch Narzotto dalle Carceri (d. 1264), with whom Prince William of Villehardouin had been involved two decades before. Felisa was then caring for her several children. Licario fell in love with her, or she with him, and they were secretly married. The lady Felisa's family rejected her new husband with contempt, and Licario returned in an angry mood to his home in the southern part of the island. There in the mountains, "the gates of the wind," near Carystus, Licario had a stronghold.¹⁰⁶ He fortified his rocky height, and drawing to himself some of the discontented elements in the island, he became the bane of the peasants of the countryside, but he could not bear for long to lead this inglorious life, removed from the Euboeote courts and their ceremony. He grew tired of brigandage, at least on so small a scale, and so, says Sanudo, "he went to a meeting with the captain of the fleet of the emperor [after the Byzantine naval victory at Demetrias in 1271], Sire Michael Palaeologus, and told him that he wanted to enter the emperor's service and to give him this place [his castle in the mountains], and so he entered the emperor's service and gave him this place, from which the emperor then caused much damage to the island of Negroponte and to the others. . . ."¹⁰⁷ The Euboeote and other island barons had long been preying upon Greek shores and coastal cities, and Michael VIII was pleased to have the means of interfering with their activities by occupying them at home in their own defense.

Licario served Michael VIII well, and prospered in his service. From about 1272 to 1275 he fought under the imperial banner in Asia Minor, where Sanudo says he scored a "great victory" over the Turks.¹⁰⁸ And now early in 1276 Licario had returned to the island of

¹⁰³ See the memorial of the Byzantine protonotary Ogerius, in Gay and Vitte, *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, p. 135ab, and Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pars. 4-9, pp. 552-53.

¹⁰⁴ The memorial of Ogerius, in *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, p. 136ab, and Loenertz, *op. cit.*, pars. 13-15, pp. 554-55. See above, Chapter 7, pp. 128 ff.

¹⁰⁵ *Registres de Nicolas III*, no. 384, pp. 136b-137a, and Loenertz, *op. cit.*, par. 18, p. 556.

¹⁰⁶ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, V, 27 (Bonn, I, 410), calls the place *Anemopylae*; Sanudo, *la Termopile (Regno di Romania)*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 119-20. Licario's name appears in the Greek historians as Ikarios.

¹⁰⁷ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 120; cf. Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, IV, 5, 1 (Bonn, I, 95-96).

¹⁰⁸ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 144-45, and for the dates, cf. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, "Mémoire d'Ogier," reg. no. 20, p. 561.

Negroponte as grand admiral (*mega duca*) of a Byzantine flotilla of twenty-four galleys. He began with the siege of Oreos, the ancient Histiaea, at the northern tip of the island, defeated a force of twenty Venetian galleys, and succeeded in taking the fortress town.¹⁰⁹ His activities continued through the summer and spring (1276–1277), and many Euboeotes joined him, both Greeks and Latins. He laid siege to his native city of Carystus. The siege took a long time, and Licario relieved his men of the boredom of working and waiting by pillaging Negroponte and the other islands, whose wealth and waters he knew so well. Finally he took Carystus, both the town and the “red castle,”¹¹⁰ and the delighted Emperor Michael VIII bestowed the entire island of Negroponte upon Licario as a fief, for which he was to render the military service of two hundred knights, presumably when the whole island should be conquered.¹¹¹ The emperor also gave Licario, as his wife, a noble Greek woman who possessed great wealth, and the lady Felisa was forgotten. Licario was much encouraged. The Euboeote castles of Larmena, La Clisura, and La Cuppa, already taken, were refortified, and from the ancient promontory of Artemisium Licario cast his predatory gaze upon the neighboring island of Skopelos, whose Latin inhabitants had been wont to boast, according to Sanudo, that all Romania would be lost before their island stronghold would succumb to an enemy, and they expected, if disaster ever came, to board their ships with all their treasure, and sail to safety in defiance of the enemy. But Licario knew Skopelos of old; the island lacked water; he attacked during the summer drought (of 1277) and took the island. Among his captives was the Venetian lord of Skopelos, Filippo Ghisi, a relative of Andrea and Geremia Ghisi who had shared with the famous Marco Sanudo the conquest of the Archipelago. Without bothering to secure a dispensation, Filippo had married his own

cousin Isabetta, daughter of the lord Geremia, and had seized Skopelos, Skyros, and some other islands from his own family. Filippo was a bold and handsome fellow, eloquent too, but he took rather too grand a view of himself, in the opinion of Sanudo, for he used to attribute to himself, with classical pride, Ovid's line to the effect that he was too great a man for fortune to injure (*Maior sum, quam cui possit fortuna nocere*).¹¹² Those whom the gods wish to destroy, however, they first make mad, and the captured Filippo was sent to Constantinople, where he long remained in the imprisonment to which an injured fortune had destined him.¹¹³

Despite Licario's astonishing successes on Negroponte and in the islands, even as far afield as Cerigo and Cerigotto (to the south of the Morea), a Byzantine army under John Synadenus and Michael Caballarius, which had been sent against John Ducas of Neopatras, was badly defeated in the plain of Pharsala. Synadenus was captured. Caballarius fled, and although some of John Ducas's Frankish knights set off after him in hot pursuit, they could not overtake him. But Caballarius, giving a free rein to his horse, mistakenly thought that all danger lay behind him. He ran headlong into a tree, and died soon after.¹¹⁴ During these years it must have seemed to Michael VIII that only Licario could emerge the winner in an engagement with the Latins. The fate which John Ducas had tempted more than once, more tolerant in his case than in that of Filippo Ghisi of Skopelos, preserved his rule on the aery height of Neopatras for almost twenty years longer.

Licario was untiring, and success whetted his ambition. Late in the year 1279 or early in 1280, with reinforcements for operations both on land and sea, he overran the island of Negroponte from Oreos to the capital city of Negroponte, the ancient Chalcis. The triarch Giberto II da Verona and his cousin John de la Roche, “lord of the duchy of Athens,” both of whom happened to be in the city of Negroponte, went

¹⁰⁹ Loenertz, *op. cit.*, regg. nos. 23–24, pp. 562, 571.

¹¹⁰ When Carystus fell, Licario took the young Guidotto de Cicon, son of the late lord Othon (d. 1264–1265?), a captive to Constantinople. Guidotto's mother was Agnese Ghisi, the sister or half-sister of the island dynasts Geremia and Andrea Ghisi, on which see Loenertz, “Généalogie des Ghisi . . .,” *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), 160–61, and *Les Ghisi* (1975), pp. 34–37, 53.

¹¹¹ Licario's Euboeote campaign and receipt of the island as an imperial fief should be put in the years 1276–1277 (cf. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, “Mémoire d'Ogier,” reg. no. 25, p. 562, correcting Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3 [1932], no. 2042, p. 72).

¹¹² *Metamorphoses*, VI, 195.

¹¹³ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 122–24, and cf. Stefano Magno, *Estratti degli Annali veneti*, also in Hopf, *Chron. gr.-rom.*, pp. 181–82. On Filippo Ghisi, see Loenertz, *Or. Christ. period.*, XXVIII, 127, 130, 131, 140; he died before 22 December, 1284 (*ibid.*, p. 325). Cf. *Les Ghisi*, pp. 46, 48–49, 53–55, 323–24, 364.

¹¹⁴ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, V, 27 (Bonn, I, 411–12); and on Licario's island conquests, including Lemnos (*Stalimene*), see Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 124–25, 127.

out to meet the enemy. Licario waited for them with a large body of men-at-arms, which included Spaniards, Catalans, and some Sicilians, who had once been in the employ of King Manfred. He met them in a decisive engagement near the modern village of Vatondas, a few miles northeast of the city of Negroponte, and scored a signal victory over them. John de la Roche was struck with a lance and fell wounded to the ground; suffering, as always, from the gout, he had had trouble keeping his feet in the stirrups; now he was unable to remount his horse, and so was captured. According to Sanudo, Giberto da Verona was killed in the encounter, but Nicephorus Gregoras gives us a more dramatic account of how, after Giberto, whom he calls the "ruler of Euboea," was captured at Vatondas, he was taken to Constantinople. As he stood at the door of the reception hall of the imperial palace, a prisoner of war at the mercy of his captors, he watched the Emperor Michael VIII seated upon a throne, senators standing around him; then he saw Licario, the brother-in-law he had scorned to accept, "but yesterday and the day before a servant, now clothed in magnificent raiment." Licario went in and out with the easy confidence of a Byzantine grandee, at home in the exalted atmosphere of an imperial court. Now Licario was whispering something in the emperor's ear, and Giberto dropped dead at the sight, "having been unable to bear the unexpected issue and the violence of fortune."¹¹⁵ But with John de la Roche many others were captured, and the triumph of Licario was no less spectacular and complete even if Giberto was not in fact a witness to its final scene.

Almost twenty years before this (in 1260), Michael VIII had held Prince William of Villehardouin a prisoner, and the price of his release, as we have seen, had been the cession of the Moreote fortresses of Mistra, Old Maina, and Monemvasia. According to Pachymeres, Michael had also demanded Argos and Nauplia at the time,¹¹⁶ but William had not been able to give up the fiefs of the lord Guy de la Roche, who had

held them as his vassal. It is strange indeed that Michael did not now insist upon the surrender of Argos and Nauplia in return for John de la Roche's release; perhaps he did, and John replied that he could not give them up without his suzerain's consent, and that could never have been secured, for William, throughout the last decade of his life the vassal of Charles of Anjou, was the chief enemy of the Greeks in the Morea. In any event the emperor seems to have entertained a very high regard for John de la Roche of Athens; he offered John his daughter in marriage, it is said, to provide the lord of Athens with an heir for his fair lands in Boeotia and Attica; but John was ill, and as he had previously been obliged to refuse a Ducaena as his bride, so now he was unable to marry a Palaeologina. Michael himself saw, when John was brought into the imperial presence, that he was so badly afflicted "that he appeared to be outside himself, and that he had but a little while to live," and so Michael consented to John's paying him a ransom of 30,000 solidi (*soldi di grossi*), and "the said duke, having returned to his own Athens, died shortly thereafter, and there succeeded him in the duchy his brother, Messer William de la Roche, the lord of Livadia. . . ."¹¹⁷

When the news of the defeat of Vatondas and the peril of Negroponte reached John de la Roche's cousin Jacques, baron of Veligosti and governor of the Athenian possessions of Argos and Nauplia, the latter hastily gathered a cavalry force, and traversing the duchy of Athens he arrived at Negroponte as soon as he could, according to Sanudo, completing in twenty-four hours a march that usually required three days. Jacques de la Roche entered the city, and set himself with great vigor to its defense, co-operating with the Venetian bailie Niccolò Morosini Rosso (1278-1280), later called "the good bailie" (*il bon bailo*) in Negroponte, because he spent some 14,000 solidi upon the city's defenses. Licario was not disposed to face such opposition; he abandoned the siege of Negroponte, and gave his unkind attention to conquering the rest of the island; in fact it was now, says Sanudo, that Larmena, La Cuppa, and La Clisura were seized and fortified. The chronology of events is not easy to reconstruct. Licario also took the castle of Filla, of which some remains still exist on the road from Afrati to Vasilikon, guarding the Lelantian plain, "so that

¹¹⁵ Gregoras, *Hist. byzant.*, IV, 5, 2-3 (Bonn, I, 96-97); Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 125-26; Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, IV, 27 (Bonn, I, 411). D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 235 ff., 295 ff., seems to put Licario's campaigns a few years too early.

¹¹⁶ Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, I, 31 (Bonn, I, 88). The battle of Pelagonia and its consequences are dealt with above; the sources relating to the price William paid for his release are collected in Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. 3, no. 1895, pp. 38-39.

¹¹⁷ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 136; Pachymeres, *Mich. Pal.*, IV, 31, and V, 27 (Bonn, I, 328, 413).

he came to be lord of all the territory outside of Negroponte, and no one could go with safety to the Lelantian plain, nor bless the cross at the fountain" [of Arethusa at Epiphany].¹¹⁸ Terror reigned in Negroponte and the islands; Seriphos and Siphnos were taken; other castles on the mainland were occupied; and Sanudo informs us that the de la Roche of Nauplia suffered severely from Licario's corsairs.¹¹⁹

The de la Roche themselves had apparently been a little careless about the suppression of piracy at Nauplia, when it was presumably to their advantage to look the other way. When Guy de la Roche was at the court of Louis IX in June, 1259, there were pilgrims and merchants present to complain of the losses they had suffered at the hands of "corsairs of Nauplia" and also (according to Sanudo) to assert Guy's failure to see that justice was done them.¹²⁰ Sanudo was a good Venetian and sensitive to the damage done by corsairs to merchant shipping. When Licario sailed the Aegean, on and off for almost four years (1276–1280), always in search of Latin prey, Venetian merchants probably suffered increased losses. For some weeks preceding March, 1278, three Venetian judges received petitions, examined claims, heard witnesses, and approved assessments of damage caused to citizens and subjects of the Republic by Greek pirates and freebooters despite the truce supposedly existing between Venice and Byzantium. There are only two references to Licario in the depositions, which include cases extending back over a half-dozen years and more, but he sustained the atmosphere of warfare in the Aegean and provided a sensational model for offensive action. The names of certain corsairs are recurrent, among them one Bulgarinus de Ania. On Monday, 16 December, 1275, for example, Bulgarinus came upon five Venetian merchants at Andros with a small transport loaded with merchandise for Negroponte. He asked them where they hailed from, and was told, "We are all Venetians from Negroponte." "Just the people I'm looking for," he replied; "I want to get Venetians and I search for them!" He seized them all, stamped their letters of security under foot, took all their goods and other possessions, and left them penniless on the shore. Their losses were not

great, only 231 hyperperi including the boat, but adventurers like Bulgarinus were everywhere. Some merchants lost much more heavily, and such rampant piracy was a grave deterrent to trade.¹²¹

As for Licario, at the pinnacle of his fame and good fortune, he passes from the pages of history (about 1280) with the same suddenness as he made his first appearance. He had done extraordinarily well for Michael VIII, and caused vast damage to the prosperity and security of the Latins in the Aegean. Some of the islands which he captured remained thenceforth under Byzantine rule until they fell, eventually, to the Turks. What became of Licario, however, his wealthy wife, and their children is not known. Michael VIII died in December, 1282, eight months after the Sicilian Vespers had vastly reduced the fear of the Franks in Byzantium. As usual a change of reign on the Bosphorus brought forth new imperial favorites, and perhaps Andronicus II allowed Licario to sink into an obscurity which the historical sources do nothing to dispel.

The island of Andros, where Bulgarinus left the Venetian merchants stranded on the shore, had known little but violence since the time of the Fourth Crusade. Andros had actually fallen to Venice in the partition treaty of 1204, but was occupied in 1207 by Marino Dandolo, who received it as a fief from Duke Marco I Sanudo of the Archipelago (Naxos). Sanudo and his companions had allegedly conquered the island at their own expense. The Latin *conquistadores* were a tough lot, and in Andros, as in Athens and Achaëa, the ecclesiastical current could not flow smoothly. Bishop John of Andros was a suffragan of the archbishop of Athens, who was in no position to protect him against Dandolo's highhandedness, and in any event papal policy did not encourage bishops to have recourse to their archbishops for the redress of grievances. Therefore, John carried his case to the Curia Romana.

On 21 January, 1233, John secured a bull from Pope Gregory IX, then at Anagni, excommuni-

¹¹⁸ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, pp. 126–27; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant* (1908), p. 141.

¹¹⁹ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 127.

¹²⁰ Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, p. 106.

¹²¹ *Judicium Venetorum in causis piraticis contra Graecos decisiones*, in Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, III (1857, repr. 1964), 159–281, with the account of Bulgarinus's piracy on p. 219 and the references to Licario on pp. 237 and 259. The Latin clergy fared as badly as the laity (*ibid.*, pp. 170–71). Bulgarinus was apparently a native of Anaea (*Ania*) on the Carian coast opposite the island of Samos. Anaea was a pirates' nest.

cating Marino Dandolo, whose impiety raged like a fire against both God and Holy Church. John had appeared before the pope and told his tearful tale of how Dandolo had imprisoned him, "and with a new kind of power, a layman excommunicating clerics as it were, he enjoined upon all persons in his territory under certain punishment that no one should speak to him or give him any aid or counsel." When John finally escaped this wretched tyranny and fled into exile, Dandolo despoiled him of all his possessions and ecclesiastical revenues. For eight years John had lived as an outcast in poverty (and so the conflict must have begun at least as early as the year 1225). At one point Simon, the Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1227–1232), and certain other religious and upright men had intervened in an effort to settle the differences between the bishop and the lord of Andros. Indeed, Dandolo swore to abide by the terms they arranged, but lost in his sinful arrogance, he held the prospect of excommunication in contempt, and did not show the slightest inclination to keep his word. To shake some understanding into him, therefore, provided of course that the facts were as John had stated them at the Curia, the pope ordered the bishop of Mosynopolis, the dean of the Athenian chapter, and the archdeacon of Thebes publicly to proclaim Dandolo's excommunication with the ringing of bells and the lighting of candles. They were also to see to it that all men avoided him until he had restored the exiled John's property, made amends for the injuries he had caused, and entirely ceased his harassment of both the bishop and his church. If it should prove necessary, the addressees of the bull were to invoke the aid of the secular arm: In the meantime they were to assign the impoverished bishop the revenues of the churches of Coronea, Daulia, and Thermopylae to enable him to live decently.¹²²

¹²² Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 16, fol. 74, ed. R. J. Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo, seigneur d'Andros, et son conflit avec l'évêque Jean, 1225–1238," in *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca* (1970), pp. 414–15 (an article reprinted from *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXV [1959], 165–81), and Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, I (1896), no. 1053, cols. 613–14. In the early 1850's, when he was preparing his study of Andros, Hopf knew no bishop of the island see before John de S. Catarina of Bologna, a Carmelite, whom Archbishop Nicholas of Athens consecrated on 14 August, 1345, in Negroponte (Daniel a Virgine Maria, *Speculum Carmelitanum*, II [Antwerp, 1680], no. 3268, p. 933, cited by Hopf, *Andros*, I [1855], 51 [see below for Hopf's work], and cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 89). On the Latin Patriarch

For some three years Bishop John of Andros held the bishoprics which he had thus received *in commendam*, but was left penniless once more in 1236 when their revenues were taken away from him. John had again to seek the papal presence, for Marino Dandolo had in no way relaxed his intransigence despite excommunication. The archbishop of Athens had deprived John of the churches of Daulia and Thermopylae, which he gave to a certain Conrad, who was then a canon of Athens. The Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Niccolò di Castro Arquato (1234?–1251), confirmed the grants, and even bestowed Coronea upon one Rinaldo, apparently a canon of Santa Sophia. The pope ordered the dean of Athens and the archdeacon and cantor of Thebes to have the revenues of the three churches restored to John, but the dean of Athens seems to have left Greece, and the two Theban *iudices* were in John's opinion thoroughly unreliable (*valde suspecti*). Gregory IX now received the dispossessed bishop of Andros for the third time, and on 26 October, 1238, ordered the dean, cantor, and treasurer of the Church of Corinth to restore the revenues of Daulia, Thermopylae, and Coronea to John, if the facts were found to be as he had represented them to the Curia. Expressing compassion for the poverty and hardships which the aged John had suffered through the years, Gregory directed that he should remain in possession of the said revenues until he could return to Andros and dwell peacefully in his own church.¹²³

Violence breeds violence, and the exile and loss of property which Marino Dandolo had inflicted upon the hapless bishop of Andros soon proved to be his own lot. For whatever reasons, Dandolo was himself expelled from his island domain (about 1239?) by Geremia Ghisi, lord of Skiathos, Skopelos, and Skyros, who had the assistance of his brother Andrea, lord of Tenos and Mykonos. After Dandolo's death his widow Felisa and his sister Maria Doro,

Simon, see Leo Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Patriarchats von Konstantinopel (1204–1261)* . . . Weimar, 1938, pp. 36–37.

¹²³ Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, II (1907), no. 4581, cols. 1161–62; Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 404–5. Although the bishop of Andros is among the addressees of papal letters dated 4 January, 1239, and 16 November, 1240 (*Reg. Grég. IX*, II, no. 4702, col. 1203, and fasc. 12 [Paris, 1910], no. 5308, col. 324), it is not clear that he was ever in fact restored to his see. On the Latin Patriarch Niccolò di Castro Arquato, see Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 206, and especially Santifaller, *Beiträge*, pp. 38–42.

with the Signoria itself as the third complainant, instituted at Venice a process against the brothers Ghisi, and on 11 August, 1243, the Maggior Consiglio passed motions sequestering the brothers' properties in Venice. The Doge Jacopo Tiepolo was to send to Geremia Ghisi and instruct him unconditionally to surrender into the hands of the Venetian bailie at Negroponte or some other ducal emissary before the following Easter (which would fall on 3 April, 1244) "the castle of Andros with the entire island and all the property which was seized in both the castle and island aforesaid when the castle was itself taken from the noble lord Marino Dandolo, now dead, and from his sister, the noble lady Maria Doro." According to the Venetian assessment, Dandolo's property had amounted to 36,450 hyperperi, not counting his horses and other animals, and Maria Doro's to 1,400 hyperperi, including the value of her animals. Before the feast of S. Peter (29 June, 1244) both Geremia and Andrea Ghisi were to come in person to Venice *ad obediendum precepta domini ducis et sui consilii*, although if adequate cause prevented their doing so, they might send deputies with full powers to act on their behalf. If Geremia Ghisi surrendered the castle and island of Andros, together with the properties in question, by the date specified, the doge and his council would then adjudicate the claims being made against the brothers Ghisi by the three complainants, 1) the commune of Venice, 2) the noble Jacopo Querini, who had apparently married Marino Dandolo's widow Felisa, and 3) Dandolo's sister Maria Doro. Otherwise, from the feast of S. Peter on, the brothers would be "banned" in Venetian territory everywhere in property and person (*forbanniri in habere et persona*), and their possessions would be seized and held for the satisfaction of the claims being made against them.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Karl Hopf, "Geschichte der Insel Andros und ihrer Beherrscher in dem Zeitraume von 1207–1566," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der k. Academie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, XVI (1855), 39–40 (cited elsewhere as *Andros*, I), and "Urkunden und Zusätze zur Geschichte der Insel Andros und ihrer Beherrscher . . .," *ibid.*, XXI (1856–57), doc. 1, pp. 238–39 (cited elsewhere as *Andros*, II), and cf. Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo . . .," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 405–6. Valuable as they are (and they broke much new ground), Hopf's studies contain numerous erroneous conjectures and false genealogical data, which are to some extent corrected in Loenertz, *op. cit.*, pp. 399–419. The decrees of the Maggior Consiglio initiating action against Geremia and Andrea Ghisi on 11 August, 1243 (recorded among the *consilia specialium personarum*),

Jacopo Querini, whom we can only assume to have been Felisa's husband and defender, and Dandolo's sister Maria Doro wanted the restitution of their property. Venice wanted to recover her allotted sovereignty over Andros. Geremia died some years later, apparently still in possession of the island, which Duke Angelo Sanudo then took over as suzerain. The case dragged on, becoming a *cause célèbre* in the Aegean. Andrea Ghisi tried to clear himself at Venice, and took an oath of obedience to two envoys of the Republic. A resolution of the Maggior Consiglio of 14 and 28 March, 1252, provided for instructions to be sent to Andrea that he should bend his every effort to bring about the release of the island and castle of Andros to Venetian authorities before the coming feast of All Saints (1 November). If he was successful, the money and other goods belonging to him, which were being held by the procurators of S. Mark, would be returned to him, but would (alas!) still be retained for a year as a pledge for the satisfaction of certain charges, including piracy, which had been lodged against him in Venice. In the meantime, up to the feast of All Saints, Andrea could invest his sequestered assets in pepper, wax, silk, gold, and silver. The transactions would be supervised by the procurators of S. Mark. But if the Republic did not secure possession of Andros on or before All Saints, Andrea's money and goods were again to be confiscated, and he would again fall under the ban of the state.¹²⁵ Indeed, it would appear that the only way Andrea could escape the ban would be to persuade Duke Angelo to give up the island to the persistent Signoria.

Venetian procedures were cumbersome, and the state was unyielding. At long length by resolution of the Maggior Consiglio on 19 March, 1253, the procurators of S. Mark were to recall within a month all the funds of Andrea Ghisi which had been let out to investors, under a penalty of two solidi for each pound not repaid on time. A month being deemed too short notice, the term was prolonged until 18 May, and thereafter further adjustments were made.¹²⁶ On 10

are re-edited in Roberto Cessi, ed., *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*, II (Bologna, 1931), nos. 1–2, pp. 141–42.

¹²⁵ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. II, pp. 239–40; Cessi, *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio*, II, sec. XIII, doc. II, pp. 119–20, ". . . die XIII intrante marcio . . . die quarto exeunte superscripti mensis marcii. . ."

¹²⁶ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. III, p. 240; Cessi, *Maggior Consiglio*, II, no. 6, p. 143.

January, 1259, Marino Ghisi of the parish of S. Moisè, holding a letter of commission from Andrea, stood warranty for him to the extent of 30,000 pounds Venetian (which was probably the total of Andrea's assets then held by the procurators of S. Mark) to remove him from the ban and allow him safely to come to Venice for a year and a day to settle his affairs and see justice done before the doge and in the courts both on his own account and on that of the complainants against him.¹²⁷ On 28 March (1259) the ban was finally withdrawn, and Andrea could return to Venice.¹²⁸

But Andrea never came back home to see whether he could find his way out of the labyrinth in which he was caught. He was an old man now, very old. Twenty years had passed since his brother Geremia had seized Andros, and more than fifty years had passed since the incredible period of the conquest. It is not clear when Andrea was first accused *super facto raubariorum*, of "robberies" at sea, but doubtless some of the complainants and witnesses had died in the meantime. Andrea probably died about this time (1260–1261), and some twenty years later, on 17 October, 1280, the Venetian government took steps to satisfy the claims of those whom the procurators of S. Mark had listed in their records as his just creditors, payments being made "from the monies which belonged to the late nobleman, Andrea Ghisi."¹²⁹

So much for the final disposition of Andrea Ghisi's Venetian property, but the affair of Andros was still not settled. The lady Felisa, Marino Dandolo's widow, had recovered the half of the island which was her dower right, to which Duke Marco II Sanudo, who had succeeded his father Angelo as duke of Naxos early in 1262, must obviously have given his consent. According to Marino Sanudo, after the lady Felisa's death, Niccolò Querini da Ca

Grande left S. Jean d'Acre in the Holy Land, where he had been the Venetian bailie (1278–1280?), "and came into Romania to ask Messer Marco Sanudo for the half of the island of Andros which milady Felisa . . . had held and possessed." Niccolò has replaced the Jacopo Querini of the Venetian decree of 1243 in pressing a claim to Andros; it is hard to escape the conclusion that Niccolò was Felisa's son by her second marriage, to Jacopo; but even so Niccolò had no right to any part of Marino Dandolo's fief, and Felisa's dower right lapsed with her death. But he made the claim, and Duke Marco II rejected it, stating that he was prepared to answer for his decision (says Marino Sanudo) "in the court of his prince" [Charles of Anjou, now prince of Achaea]. Niccolò carried his case to Venice, where the jurists and politicians remembered that Andros had been assigned to the Republic in the division of Byzantine territory in 1204. A resolution was adopted in the Maggior Consiglio on 12 March, 1282, "on behalf of the commune of Venice, the nobleman Niccolò Querini, and other persons," that before the coming feast of S. Michael (29 September) Marco Sanudo should himself come or send a qualified deputy to Venice, where the doge would review the affair of Andros. If he did not appear or send someone in his stead, action would be taken against him.¹³⁰

Marino Sanudo says that Marco II Sanudo was summoned to Venice *come cittadino venezian*, but he was also the duke of Naxos, and in a firm reply to the Signoria Marco stated that his grandfather, the first duke, had held Andros, just as he had held Naxos, by right of conquest and imperial investiture, by an investiture in fact "freer than that of any baron who was then in Romania." Marco II's memorial to the Doge Giovanni Dandolo, justifying his retention of Andros, is one of the best-known documents in the history of Latin rule in the Aegean. Reviewing the history of the duchy of Naxos-Andros from the beginning and noting the shift of suzerainty from the Latin emperors to the princes of Achaea, Marco stated that his grandfather, his father, and he himself had done homage to their overlords in each generation and with each change of suzerainty, with never a word of protest or remonstrance from Venice. Upon the death of William, last of the Villehardouin princes (in 1278), Marco stated,

¹²⁷ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. IV, p. 241; Cessi, *Maggior Consiglio*, II, no. 17, p. 145, who dates the document 10 January, 1258, "indictione secunda" (i.e. 1259).

¹²⁸ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. v, p. 241; Cessi, *Maggior Consiglio*, II, no. 18, p. 146, "die IIII exeunte marcio" (i.e. 28 March).

¹²⁹ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. vi, pp. 241–42; Cessi, *Maggior Consiglio*, II, no. 128, pp. 167–68. The complainants against Andrea charged that "se esse raubatos in mari" (*ibid.*, no. 18, p. 146); on his career see Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), no. 3, p. 127, and especially *Les Ghisi* (1975), pp. 38–43, 75. Andrea was still alive in February, 1260, not 1266, as stated in Loenertz (*ibid.*, p. 42, on which see the document of 22 December, 1284, *ibid.*, p. 284).

¹³⁰ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. vii, p. 242; Cessi, *Maggior Consiglio*, II, no. 142, p. 170.

"we rendered the homage we owed, to our lord the king" [Charles of Anjou]. Affirming his dedication to the honor and prosperity of Venice, of which he claimed to have given proof in times past, Marco professed to have no knowledge of the Republic's claim to Andros "in accordance with the partition of the empire" (*pro imperii partitione*). But if Andros had really devolved upon Venice in the partition, Marco would gladly render due homage to the Republic.

His memorial was probably being prepared about the time news of the Sicilian Vespers reached Naxos. Charles of Anjou's position appeared to be weakened, and Marco was aware that Venice was hostile to Angevin pretensions in the Levant. But he made it clear that in his opinion Venice had no right to summon him to the lagoon for the adjudication of a specious claim to part of Andros. When on 19 March, 1277, the Republic had negotiated a renewal of the treaty (*treuga*) with Michael VIII Palaeologus, his name was not listed with those of other Venetians; he was given a separate status, and the Republic declined to take responsibility for any infraction of the treaty of which he might be guilty, for he held his domains of Prince William of Achaea, who was still living at the time. Marco insisted that, according to the Assizes of Romania, Niccolò Querini had no right to any part of Andros, his alleged claim should first be adjudged in the feudal court at Naxos, and appeal from the judgment of that court should be directed to Charles of Anjou, suzerain of the duke of Naxos-Andros, and certainly not to the doge of Venice. He concluded his memorial with an appeal to the Signoria not to allow discord to arise between the Republic and Charles of Anjou because of the pretensions of a grasping citizen, whose claims were contrary to feudal law and justice.¹³¹

Whether Duke Marco II Sanudo was or was not actually to be considered a Venetian citizen, the Querini were influential, and Niccolò was active in the affairs of the Republic. There was strife in the Aegean, and in 1286 Marco got caught up in a war with the Ghisi over a stolen ass; the war cost the contestants, according to Marino Sanudo, more than 30,000 solidi. Marco II wanted peace in the islands and peace with the Venetians, and so he listened to the overtures of Niccolò Giustinian, the Venetian

bailie in Negroponte (1291-1293), who was acting on the persistent Niccolò Querini's behalf. An agreement was reached whereby Marco bought out Querini's pretensions to half the island of Andros for 5,000 "pounds" (*lire*) to be paid over a period of five years, and thus brought the extraordinary case to a close.¹³² The affairs of Andros, like those of Athens and Achaea, show that the heirs of the Fourth Crusaders had inherited with their lands both the rivalries and the confusion which had attended the conquest.

When John de la Roche died in 1280, he was succeeded by his brother William, the first member of the family officially to bear the title Duke of Athens. Already lord of Livadia, William had acquired the northern fiefs of Gravia, Siderocastron, Zeitounion, and Gardiki by his marriage with Helena Ducaena of Neopatras, who became the mother of his son Guy II, known as Guyot or Guidotto. Although, when the war of the Euboeote succession broke out, Guy I had refused to recognize Prince William of Villehardouin as his suzerain (except for Argos, Nauplia, and half Thebes), and John's own position with respect to the Achaean suzerainty is unclear, Duke William immediately recognized Charles of Anjou as his overlord. He asked, however, to be excused from appearing at the Neapolitan court to do homage in person, for his presence was required in Greece. Charles granted his request on 8 July, 1280, and also allowed him to export fifty steeds from Apulia for use in his Greek domains.¹³³

William's court seems to have been a center of Frankish chivalry, like that of the Villehardouin before him. His brother-in-law, Count Hugh de Brienne, stayed with him for a while when he came to take over half the barony of Karytaina, which his young wife Isabelle de la Roche had left at her death (her first husband Geoffrey of Briel had held the barony when he died in 1275). Another relative, Gautier de la Roche-Ray, was precentor in the Parthenon, the cathedral church of Athens. But actually little is known of William's reign over Attica and Boeotia. No

¹³¹ Hopf, *Andros*, II, doc. VIII, pp. 242-45.

¹³² Hopf, *Andros*, I, esp. pp. 39-51; Marino Sanudo, *Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. gréco-romanes* (1873), pp. 112-14; and see the summary of the whole affair in D. Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale* (1971), pp. 273-80.

¹³³ Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 320b (repr. 1960, I, 254b); C. Minieri-Riccio, "Il Regno di Carlo I d'Angiò . . .," *Archivio storico italiano*, 4th ser., III (1879), 162.

document issued in his name has yet been discovered. In 1282, however, he equipped nine ships in Euboea to add to an Angevin fleet under the command of Jean Chauderon, the constable of Achaea, for service against the Greeks, whose mounting successes had worried the Latin feudatories for more than twenty years.¹³⁴

During the four years of Charles II the Lamé's captivity in Sicily and Aragon-Catalonia (1284–1289), his cousin Count Robert II of Artois served as bailie or regent. Robert was inevitably much preoccupied with affairs in Naples, and quickly turned to the most powerful feudatory in Greece for governance of the principality of Achaea. Robert appointed, as Angevin bailie and vicar-general, Duke William de la Roche, who had a strong military base in Athens and Thebes, and was connected by marriage with the Sebastocrator John Ducas of Neopatras. William's tenure of office was peaceful (1285–1287). He looked to the defenses of the principality, and built the strategic castle of Dematra near the upper reaches of the Pamisos to guard the descent into Messenia. But the later de la Roche did not live long, and when William died, Robert of Artois appointed in his stead as bailie of Achaea the sturdy baron Nicholas II of S. Omer, lord of half Thebes, where he built the once-imposing castle on the Cadmea with its famous murals of the First Crusade. Nicholas went on with the work of refortifying the Morea by constructing two castles in the southwest of the peninsula. According to Hopf, Charles the Lamé removed Nicholas from office on 25 July, 1289, and about six weeks later, as we have already seen, the principality was restored to Prince William of Villehardouin's daughter Isabelle and her husband Florent of Hainaut, under whom the Morea prospered for a time, and then resumed the downward course of its history.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, pp. 320b–21a (repr., I, 254b–55a), who cites documents (destroyed in September, 1943) from the Angevin archives in Naples.

¹³⁵ Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, pp. 320a, 321a, 322b, 332 ff. (repr., I, 254a, 255a, 256b, 266 ff.). Cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 262–63. Nicholas II of S. Omer was still *vicarius et bajulus* of the principality on 16 July, 1289, as shown by a royal order issued to him on that date (Charles Perrat and Jean Longnon, eds., *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée [1289–1300]*, Paris, 1967, doc. 3, p. 23). On Nicholas, the castle he built at Thebes, his fortresses in the Morea, and his appointment as bailie, note the Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt (1904), vv. 8056–8109, pp. 522–26, and on the construction of Dematra by William de la Roche, *ibid.*, vv. 7997–8000, p. 518.

Charles II had sent royal commissioners into the Morea to see that Prince Florent and Princess Isabelle were put in possession of the principality, and at Negroponte on 22 December, 1289, the triarch Marino dalle Carceri and certain notables of Achaea attested to the fact that fealty had been sworn and homage duly rendered to the new prince and princess by the barons and feudatories of Achaea. They served as witnesses for the crown "for want of judges and a public notary, for such are not appointed by the court in the principality of Achaea." The Angevin mission had gone satisfactorily "except for the noble lady Helena, duchess of Athens, wife of the late William de la Roche, acting as guardian [*balia*] for her son [Guy II], now a minor, and the Margrave Thomas, lord of Boudonitza, who have refused to take the oath of fealty and do liege homage. . . ." ¹³⁶

William de la Roche had clearly not hesitated to do homage to Charles I of Anjou either as king of Sicily or as prince of Achaea, although for the half-century following the conquest the lords of Athens had been Achaean vassals only for Argos, Nauplia, and half the seignory of Thebes. Damala, the ancient Troezen, also owed homage to the prince of Achaea; it was, however, in the hands of a younger branch of the de la Roche family. But the submissive attitude which Guy I had shown to Prince William of Villehardouin at the parliament of Nikli (after William's victory at Mount Karydi) seems to have implied that Guy now recognized his vassalage for the lordship of Athens also. In the second treaty of Viterbo (of 27 May, 1267) Michael VIII Palaeologus is said to have overrun all the Latin empire except the principality of Achaea, and since he had not occupied the Athenian duchy, the Angevin court must have regarded the duchy as an integral part of the principality. And this was obviously Charles II's understand-

¹³⁶ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée*, doc. 9, pp. 29–31, and cf. doc. 55, pp. 61–62. Apparently the Angevins sent judges and notaries from Italy into the principality of Achaea "pro quibuslibet Curie sue negociis" (*ibid.*, doc. 51, pp. 58–59). On 12 March, 1290, Charles II authorized Florent to receive the homage of Bartolommeo I Ghisi, lord of Tenos and Mykonos (docs. 12–13, pp. 33–34). Bartolommeo was the son of Andrea, one of the conquerors of the Archipelago in 1207; he was a very old man in 1290 (Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII [1962], 127, 130, 149, 150–51, 152, 325 ff., and *Les Ghisi* [1975], pp. 90, 95–96, 98, 99, 101, 104, 106, 113, 362, 364).

ing when he granted the principality to Isabelle and her husband Florent of Hainaut.¹³⁷

Charles II had no doubt that Athens should lie under the suzerainty of Achaea. On 18 April, 1290, he wrote the Duchess Helena "that you must do homage to Florent both on his own behalf and on that of his wife for the islands and lands which you hold in the aforesaid principality." Nothing could be more certain than that he is not referring to Argos and Nauplia, because on the same day the same injunction was sent to the margrave of Boudonitza, who possessed no holdings in the Morea.¹³⁸ But early in September, 1291, the news reached Charles that Count Hugh of Brienne and Lecce, one of the high feudatories of the kingdom of "Sicily," was going to marry Helena Ducaena, the duchess of Athens, and on the fourteenth of the month he wrote Prince Florent from Tarascon in the Rhone valley that he was allowing Hugh to do the same homage "as the duchess herself has rendered to our court at another time by reason of the guardianship which she exercises for her son in the duchy of Athens." Florent was not to oppose this act of direct obeisance to the crown, for no injustice was intended, and everyone's rights would be respected without prejudice. But to resolve the contention which had arisen between Florent and Helena, Charles stated that he was summoning a representative (*procurator*) from each side to appear before him at a set time.¹³⁹

The time was set for Christmas; the royal court would still be in Provence.¹⁴⁰ But by 7 January, 1292, neither Florent nor Helena had sent procurators, and Charles, who was then at

Aix-en-Provence, repeated the summons for Pentecost (25 May),¹⁴¹ but for whatever reason the affair was settled neither that year nor the next, and from Paris on 10 October, 1293, in response to a petition from Florent, Charles named two knights and a judge to go into the Morea and investigate certain fiefs in the principality and report on the question of the de la Roche homage.¹⁴² There was need for clarification, for Guyot was growing up, and would soon be ruling the duchy himself. On the feast of S. John the Baptist (24 June) in 1294 a rich assembly of bishops and barons witnessed the apparent end of Guyot's nonage when he was knighted in a dramatic ceremony by Boniface of Verona,¹⁴³ whose chief role in the history of Athens, as we have said, was yet to be played.

The struggle for suzerainty over the Athenian duchy was obviously a quest for power and prestige. It illustrates something of the feudal mentality of the age as well as the uncertainties which Charles II's vacillation introduced into the shaky political structure of Latin hegemony in Greece. The duchess of Athens seemed to have won the contest, however, when on 9 July, 1294, Charles, now back in Italy at Melfi, expressed his willingness to accept homage and fealty directly from Duke Guyot de la Roche, who was said to have come of age, and two commissioners were appointed, an ecclesiastic and a knight, to go into Greece and receive the young duke as a royal vassal.¹⁴⁴ But on 25 July Charles suddenly informed Hugh de Brienne and the Duchess Helena that the homage and services owed for the duchy of Athens belonged to Florent and Isabelle by virtue of the royal grant he had made them of the principality. Now he was renewing the grant *de novo*, and demanded that the "relief" (*relevium*) due for Guyot's inheritance of the ducal fief be paid to Florent and Isabelle "according to the use and custom of the empire of Romania." He added that if Hugh and Helena were going to exercise further tutelage over Guyot, "you are to render the required homage for the said duchy . . . to

¹³⁷ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, introd., pp. 11–12.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, docs. 16–17, p. 36. From 26 May, 1290, Charles II gave up the title Prince of Achaea, and ordered it removed from the "great seal of our Majesty," the action being mentioned in a royal mandate of 21 July, 1290 (*ibid.*, doc. 19, p. 38, and cf. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 266).

¹³⁹ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 22, p. 41. On the same day (14 September, 1291) Charles wrote Nicholas II of S. Omer, formerly bailie of the principality (1287–1289), to receive Hugh's act of homage without prejudice to the claims and rights of Florent and Isabelle (*ibid.*, doc. 23, pp. 42–43), and a similar notice was addressed to Hugh (doc. 24, p. 43).

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, doc. 26, p. 44, dated 18 September, 1291: ". . . de regio mandato procedit ut princeps A[c]hahie consorsque ipsius et ducissa Athenarum, ex parte sui, coram eo [Karolo rege] citentur instanter ita quod infra festum Nativitatis dominice primo futurum compareant in Provincia . . . per sollempnem et legitimum procuratorem de jure illorum sufficienter instructum. . . ." Cf., *ibid.*, no. 56, p. 62.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, doc. 31, p. 47.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, no. 66, p. 69.

¹⁴³ Ramón Muntaner, *Crònica*, chap. 244, ed. Karl Lanz, *Chronik des edlen En Ramon Muntaner*, Stuttgart, 1844, pp. 437–38. Boniface was the son of Francesco and the grandson of Giberto I of Verona, triarch of Negroponte (cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs tiersiers de Négrepont," *Byzantion*, XXXV [1965], reg. no. 107, pp. 265–66, *et passim*).

¹⁴⁴ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 100, pp. 101–2. The king also took Guyot's Moreote possessions under his protection (doc. 101, p. 102).

the aforesaid princess and prince." By a privilege, duly witnessed and sealed on the same day, Charles declared that the duchy of Athens did not depend upon the crown *immediate et in capite*, "for we, within the cloister of our conscience, considering that at the time of the aforesaid concession it was our intention that the said duke's homage and services, then owed to our Curia for the duchy, had been granted like all the other rights of the principality to the said princess and prince. . . ." The decree spares no repetition to make clear that henceforth Athens lay in feudal bondage to Achaea.¹⁴⁵ Charles also directed Othon of S. Omer, who had just succeeded his brother Nicholas II as lord of half Thebes, and Thomas III d'Autremencourt, lord of Salona, as well as all Guyot's other vassals to withhold their homage and service from him as long as he failed to do homage himself to Isabelle and Florent.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, Guyot continued to drag his heels, and there was little that either Charles or Florent could do about it.

In the meantime Charles II had resumed his father's close diplomatic ties with the aging Despot Nicephorus Ducas of Epirus and the latter's wife Anna Palaeologina. As early as 1 June, 1291, Charles had given Florent of Hainaut (and the ever-useful knight Pierre de l'Isle) full authority to negotiate with the Epirotes the marriage of their daughter Thamar, preferably with Charles's fourth son Philip or, failing that, with his third son Robert of Anjou. Charles promised that he would make such provision for Thamar's prospective husband as would become the young man's princely honor and his own, "and that the said daughter of the despot and despoina shall have as her dower a third part of what we shall bestow upon our son according to the use and custom of our kingdom. . . ."¹⁴⁷ This was of course a matter of large importance both to Naples and to Arta. It required much discussion and the exchange of embassies over some three years.¹⁴⁸ But finally

on 12 July, 1294, young Philip of Anjou, who had been made prince of Taranto five months before, himself announced his forthcoming marriage to Thamar, and sent procurators to Arta to arrange the formalities of their betrothal and subscribe to the various pacts and conventions that would go with it.¹⁴⁹ The marriage took place at L'Aquila in August, and Thamar received as a dowry the inland strongholds of Angelocastro and Vrachori (Agrinion), together with the fortress towns of Vonitza, south of the Gulf of Arta, and Naupactus (Lepanto), at the entrance to the Gulf of Corinth. At the same time Charles II ceded to Philip in a grand enfeoffment (of 13 August, 1294) all the Angevin lands and rights "in the principality of Achaea, the duchy of Athens, the kingdom of Albania, the province of Thessaly [*Blachia*], and in other places of the empire or region of Romania," for which Philip would pay as feudal dues each year six bolts of samite (a heavy silk fabric) in three different colors.¹⁵⁰ Charles had in the meantime informed Florent, Isabelle, and Guyot de la Roche that, to provide a more effective bulwark against the constant attacks of enemies, he was going to centralize the defense of the Achaean principality and the Athenian duchy by granting all his rights and suzerainty over them to Philip, whose control also over Thamar's lands would presumably help bring about a new era of security among the Latin states in Greece.¹⁵¹

Once more it appeared that the duchess of Athens' delaying tactic had proved effective. She was doubtless being advised and supported by her husband Hugh de Brienne, who was very influential in Naples and was acting with her as Guyot's bailie or guardian. Now Achaea and

firmitas) between Naples and Constantinople as well as a marriage between Andronicus's eldest son Michael [IX] and Catherine of Courtenay, titular Latin empress and daughter of Philip of Courtenay, late titular emperor of Constantinople (*ibid.*, docs. 28-30, 32-34, 44, 50, 56, 62, 130, 143-44, 153-54, 158-59, 165, 169-73, 197, 218, 219).

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, doc. 103, pp. 103-4.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, doc. 116, pp. 113-14; *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon (1911), pars. 658-60, 974, pp. 262-64, 381; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, pp. 336-37 (repr., I, 270-71). For another *sex samita de tribus coloribus*, Philip also received the island of Corfu and the castle of Butrinto (Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 117, pp. 114-115). The Despoina Anna Palaeologina of Epirus came to Italy for her daughter's marriage to Philip, and as Anna prepared to return home, Charles II armed three galleys to carry her and her suite across the Adriatic (*ibid.*, doc. 126, pp. 120-21, dated 12 January, 1295).

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, docs. 80-81, 105, pp. 83-85, 105.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, docs. 106-7, pp. 105-7, and note docs. 109-11, pp. 108-10.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, doc. 108, pp. 107-8, dated 25 July, 1294. Florent and Isabelle are said to have imprisoned Othon of S. Omer for his refusal to do homage directly to them for the fief he held in the Athenian duchy (*ibid.*, doc. 134, p. 128, dated 6 February, 1295).

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, doc. 21, p. 39-40.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, docs. 41, 43, 60-62, 64-65, 68. During this period Angevin missions were also sent to the Emperor Andronicus II, whose own envoys were frequently to be found at Charles II's court, an attempt being made to arrange a "perpetual peace" (*pacis et amicitie perpetua*

Athens stood on the same level in the feudal pyramid, both vassals of Prince Philip of Taranto, himself the vassal of the Angevin king. But in fact the status of the Athenian duchy was far from settled, and now Florent and Isabelle balked at the subinfeudation of Achaea. They declined to do homage to Philip, which caused Charles II, as he wrote them on 15 March, 1295, "no small astonishment," for he and the royal council found their objections trivial, and he commanded them to do the required homage immediately upon receipt of his letter. Emissaries of Florent and Isabelle had moreover again requested him to compel the duke of Athens to do homage to them, Charles stated, "and yet on the contrary it has been claimed and put forward on behalf of our son, the prince of Taranto, that we conferred the aforesaid right of vassalage and homage from the duke of Athens upon the prince of Taranto well before we granted it to you." In this connection Hugh de Brienne, acting as Guyot's bailie, was said legally to have taken the oath of vassalage to the prince of Taranto. (Obviously Hugh had seen an opportunity to sidetrack Florent and Isabelle.) All this involved a new problem which Charles, since he was then in Rome, was unwilling to resolve, but which within six months of his return to his own kingdom, with his advisers and the relevant documents at hand, he would decide. At that time Florent and Isabelle as well as Philip of Taranto could either personally or through procurators state their case in full. In the meantime Florent and Isabelle were not to harass the young duke of Athens in any way.¹⁵² One would think that by this time Florent and Isabelle had stated their claim to the Athenian suzerainty as fully and frequently as necessary.

On 6 October, 1295, Charles wrote Florent and Isabelle again on the same score, observing that if a vassal was bound to defend his lord's property, the lord was in turn bound to defend the vassal's. The Despot Nicephorus Ducas was Charles's vassal, and Charles must defend his lands, including Thamar's dowry, which had

gone to Philip of Taranto. Charles therefore demanded that Florent and Isabelle render in defense of Thamar's lands the military service they owed the Angevins for the principality, "without prior judgment of our right or that of the said prince of Taranto." They were also to require, if necessary to force, the barons and feudatories of Achaea to do likewise. Furthermore, if Florent and Isabelle did not render the required homage to the prince of Taranto, Charles would command their own barons and feudatories to withhold obedience from them, and require them to answer in the royal presence for their contumacy.¹⁵³

Whether to answer for her contumacy or not, Isabelle did go to Italy. Royal orders of 26–27 September, 1296, locate her in Brindisi, preparing to return to Achaea.¹⁵⁴ She seems to have been an attractive person, and the amiable Charles II was fond of her; she sometimes appears in the documents as *soror nostra carissima*, and after all he gave her back the principality of Achaea, which his father never evinced any serious intention of doing. Isabelle did her work well, doubtless discussing her problem with both Charles and Philip of Taranto. But while at the Neapolitan court she did homage in person to Philip of Taranto as her acknowledged suzerain of Achaea.

The Angevins had gained their point, and they conceded hers. Also Hugh de Brienne, the mainstay of Athens, had died some weeks before, and Duke Guyot no longer had a strong advocate in Naples. On 1 October, 1296, therefore, Charles II wrote Guyot that he had previously granted Isabelle and Florent and their heirs "in perpetuity the homage and service due our Curia for the duchy of Athens . . . , determining then and indeed declaring that you and your heirs would render this homage and service to the aforesaid prince and princess. . . ." The king stated that the registers in the royal archives bore full witness to this grant, and he expressed wonder that Guyot had so long delayed the execution of his mandate. Philip of Taranto had just withdrawn all claim to the Athenian homage, removed all doubt as to the proper recipients of the duke's obeisance, "and consents and agrees that you shall render the said homage and service to the . . . princess and prince. . . ." Charles therefore renewed his injunction that, despite all past enact-

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, docs. 145–46, pp. 134–35. On 8 April, 1295, Charles II commissioned two procurators to go to Greece and receive the *sacramentum fidelitatis et ligium homagium ac promissio servicii* from the Duchess Helena of Athens and her two brothers Constantine and Angelus, the former of whom was the "duke" of Neopatra (docs. 147–49, pp. 136–38). As of this date, obviously, Charles intended Athens to stand in direct dependence upon the crown, but such was his indecision that he found it difficult to make up his mind for long.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, doc. 161, pp. 145–46, and *cf.* docs. 162–63.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, docs. 188–89, p. 162.

ments to the contrary, Guy must now comply with the present order thus to do homage "under penalty of losing the entire duchy . . . , [and] you may know for certain that, if you delay further or disregard [this command], we shall order procedure against you in such fashion that you will understand what it is to disobey our orders."¹⁵⁵

Whether Guyot delayed further, is hard to say. Presumably he yielded, and did homage, for the dispute over the Athenian suzerainty disappears from the documents. But after seven years of peace in the Morea, Florent of Hainaut was now (in the summer and fall of 1296) preoccupied with a renewal of hostilities between Greeks and Latins, in the course of which the Frankish castle of S. George, which guarded the entrance into Skorta (Arcadia), between Karytaina and Leondari, was betrayed into the hands of Turkish mercenaries under the Byzantine captain at Mistra. Despite his best efforts, Florent was unable to recover the castle. With the approach of winter, he withdrew to Andravida, where he died, apparently on 23 January, 1297,¹⁵⁶ and Isabelle set about ruling the principality by herself. With Florent dead, the question of the Athenian suzerainty was likely to come up again, and Nicholas III of S. Omer, the marshal of Achaea, proposed that Isabelle marry her three-year-old daughter Mahaut, her only child, to Guyot, now the dashing young duke of Athens. It would be "the noblest marriage in any part of Romania." The Chronicle of the Morea relates that the marriage was quickly arranged.¹⁵⁷

At least the betrothal was quickly arranged, and the little Mahaut was entrusted to the care of the ducal court at Thebes and Athens. Of course the marriage of Duke Guyot and the Princess Mahaut would bring to an end the long-continued contention over who was suzerain of Athens. But it also made possible Guyot's own succession to the principality, and Charles II immediately interposed an objection. On 3 July, 1299, he wrote Guyot that the principality of Achaea had devolved upon him by the treaty of Viterbo, and that he had bestowed it as an act

of special grace upon Isabelle, subject to certain express conditions, one of which she was now seeking to violate, for no heiress to Achaea could be married without the royal consent. Charles had not been consulted during the negotiations between Isabelle and Guyot. Mahaut was still *in annis infancie*, and she was said to be related to Guyot within the prohibited third degree of consanguinity, for which no papal dispensation had been secured. Charles therefore peremptorily ordered the young duke of Athens to return Mahaut to her mother within three days of his receipt of the royal letter. When Mahaut had reached the proper age, her mother might decide, "with our consent, however, to whom she ought to be married, whether to you, if it please the Church and us, or to another." Charles threatened appropriate action if his order was disregarded, and directed Guyot to inform him "what you have done about this matter."¹⁵⁸

Guyot's response, if any, to the king's letter is unknown, but his advisers and Isabelle's had been well aware of the canonical impediment to the proposed marriage, and had already appealed to the Curia Romana for the necessary dispensation. Some five weeks after the date of Charles's letter to Guyot, Pope Boniface VIII granted the dispensation at Anagni (on 9 August, 1299), presumably after some consultation with the Neapolitan court. The pope made his decision *pro bono pacis*,¹⁵⁹ and he may have exerted some pressure on Charles, who was likely to yield to pressure. At any rate he did yield, and on 20 April, 1300, he wrote Guyot consenting to the marriage with Mahaut, and directing him to observe the truce which, with royal authorization, Isabelle was then seeking to make with the Emperor Andronicus II.¹⁶⁰

When Guyot came of age, he took over the

¹⁵⁵ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, doc. 211, pp. 181-82.

¹⁵⁶ Georges Digard, ed., *Les Registres de Boniface VIII*, II (Paris, 1890-1904), no. 3175, col. 465. Charles II was the vassal of the Church for the kingdom of Sicily, and had himself done homage to Boniface VIII on 17 February, 1295 (*ibid.*, I [Paris, 1884-1907], no. 117, col. 46). Dispensations for marriage within the fourth degree of consanguinity were not uncommon, and Boniface had granted one in May, 1295, to Nicholas III of S. Omer himself (*ibid.*, I, no. 139, col. 53). In December, 1299, Count Riccardo of Cephalonia and Marguerite of Villehardouin, Isabelle's sister, received a similar dispensation (*ibid.*, II, no. 3285, col. 523).

¹⁶⁰ Perrat and Longnon, *Actes*, docs. 237-39, pp. 201-2, and for Isabelle's authorization to make a truce with Andronicus II covering the Latin lands in Romania, see, *ibid.*, doc. 236, p. 201.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, doc. 191, pp. 163-65, and cf. doc. 192.

¹⁵⁶ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 801-27, pp. 318-27; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, p. 346 (repr., I, 280); Longnon, *L'Empire latin* (1949), pp. 277-78.

¹⁵⁷ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 831-40, pp. 329-33, and cf. the Greek *Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt (1904), vv. 7974-84, pp. 516, 518.

rule of the Athenian duchy himself, and clearly did not get along well with his mother, the dowager Duchess Helena, and "not observing the debt of filial devotion which he owed her, he seized with violence the abbey of Stiris [S. Luke in Phocis] with its rights and appurtenances, in which her dower had been established, as well as much movable property." Although at the king's command Philip of Taranto had sent letters both to Guyot and to his prospective mother-in-law Isabelle, ordering the return of Helena's property, they had had no effect, owing to Guyot's stubborn refusal to comply. Helena had therefore renewed her appeal to Charles II, who on 31 July, 1299, ordered Isabelle to force Guyot to restore the abbey of S. Luke and the duchess's other property. Otherwise, Charles stated, he would have the bailie of Philip of Taranto's Greek and Epirote lands proceed against Guyot, which would not be necessary if the present letter had the desired effect.¹⁶¹

Guyot and his mother also disputed possession of the fortress towns of Zeitounion and Gravia, which had been part of her dowry, and which she was apparently "disposed to sell or alienate" against her son's wishes and to his "evident prejudice and loss." Now it was Guyot who appealed to Charles II, who replied on 12 January, 1300, that he was ordering Philip of Taranto's bailie in Romania to hear both sides of the case, and render a decision as to who should legally hold the two towns. Charles also wrote Helena to take "no further action" (*nulla novitas*) with regard to the towns, and informed her son that if she ultimately refused to abide by the bailie's decision, force would be in order. In this event Guyot would be authorized to take possession of Zeitounion and Gravia, but only after he had formally protested against her intransigence and given her an opportunity to abide by the bailie's decision.¹⁶²

Helena Ducaena's disagreements with her son were among the least of the hostilities which some of the Ducae manifested toward one another. Although the Despot Nicephorus of Epirus and his bastard brother John Ducas of Neopatras could combine in their early years against the Emperor Michael VIII, they bore no love for each other, and Nicephorus's wife Anna Palaeologina, who remained loyal to the imperial family in Constantinople, was always inimical to the Ducae of Neopatras. The ob-

streperous John Ducas died sometime before 8 April, 1295, and his son Constantine succeeded him as "duke" of Neopatras.¹⁶³ Together with his brother Angelus, Constantine promptly invaded Epirus in force, and on 1 July King Charles II ordered Florent of Hainaut, then prince of Achaea, and the young Guyot de la Roche to help repel their destructive attacks upon the despotate.¹⁶⁴ A year later both Constantine and Nicephorus sent embassies to Charles II at Brindisi;¹⁶⁵ peace was restored between Neopatras and Epirus; and Charles even directed the Latin lords in Greece to assist Constantine against the Byzantines, to whom Nicephorus and Anna had appealed for aid.¹⁶⁶ Nicephorus did not long survive the peace, however, and his son Thomas inherited what remained of the despotate after the Angevins had occupied the lands which comprised Thamar's dowry. Thomas was a boy, and his mother Anna ruled in his name. Constantine hated her, because she had betrayed his elder brother Michael into some eight years' imprisonment and a violent death in Constantinople,¹⁶⁷ and in 1301–1302 he again invaded Epirus.¹⁶⁸ But he died in the midst of his campaigning, and left the duchy of Neopatras to his young son John II (1302–1318). As Constantine contemplated death, he wanted his nephew Guyot de la Roche, the duke of Athens, to serve as John II's guardian, which Guyot was glad to do (as the Moreote chronicler informs us), for it increased his honor and authority in Greece.¹⁶⁹

The duke of Neopatras was a boy, unable to handle his own affairs; his guardian, the duke of Athens, a young man, untried in a crisis. Anna Palaeologina saw the opportunity to strike at Neopatras, and as the Byzantines and Bulgars were themselves preparing to move into Thessaly, her troops suddenly descended upon Pharnarion, between Trikkala and Karditza. Guyot de la Roche met the challenge with a call to all his vassals, including Nicholas of S. Omer, marshal of the Morea and lord of half Thebes; Thomas

¹⁶³ Cf., *ibid.*, doc. 147, p. 136.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, docs. 155–56, pp. 141–43, and cf. doc. 161, pp. 145–46.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, docs. 183–84, p. 159.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, doc. 185, p. 160, dated 3 September, 1296; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, p. 355 (repr., I, 289).

¹⁶⁷ Geo. Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, I, 25, 27 (Bonn; II, 67–68, 72–77).

¹⁶⁸ Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, pp. 356b, 357b–58 (repr., I, 290 ff.).

¹⁶⁹ *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 873–80, pp. 345–48.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, doc. 220, p. 191, and cf. doc. 222, p. 192.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, doc. 232, pp. 198–99.

III d'Autremencourt, the lord of Salona; and Boniface of Verona, lord of Carystus. He also summoned "the gentlemen of Negroponte . . . that they should come to help him in this war which the despoina [Anna] had commenced against him." The call was for three months' service in the field, and although Philip of Savoy, by this time prince of Achaea, forbade his marshal to go off to fight in Thessaly, Nicholas of S. Omer assembled 89 mounted men, of whom 13 were knights, and the rest squires and archontes. He went from Andravida to Vostitza (Aigion), thence across the Gulf of Corinth to Veteranitza, north to Salona (Amphissa), through the divide between Mount Elato and Parnassus to Gravia, and on through the valley of the Ellada to Zeitounion (Lamia). At Gravia he had been informed that Guyot had waited for him a week at the Ellada, and then gone north into Thessaly. Nicholas spent two days in Guyot's former encampment by the Ellada, resting his tired men and horses. On the third day he pushed on to Domokos, "to a castle which is at the entrance to the plain of Thessaly." Guyot was only six miles away.¹⁷⁰

The Moreote chronicler is well informed. He was probably in Nicholas of S. Omer's retinue, and he has left us a vivid description of an army on the march at the beginning of the fourteenth century:

When the marshal rose in the morning [breaking camp at Domokos], he set his people in the order in which they should ride. He made the beasts of burden go first; he had more than a hundred of them, mules as well as horses, his own and those of his people. And next he had the armed horse go one after the other; there were more than a hundred and thirty of them, and grooms led them with the right hand. Then two squires followed, carrying his two banners attached to lances, and after the banners another two squires, one of whom carried his shield before him, and another his lance with a pennon bearing his arms. . . . And he rode next, with a single knight close by; then the knights came, riding two by two; and finally the squires in line. So they rode, in such array that their troop stretched out a good two miles.¹⁷¹

As Nicholas of S. Omer pushed on, he met Boniface of Verona, lord of Carystus, who held of the duke two castles and now came to his aid

with 100 knights. Thomas III of Salona and the aged Francesco da Verona also appeared with 200 men in their company. Guyot rode out two miles to meet them, and embraced the marshal (says the chronicler) "more than ten times." Guyot and Nicholas dined together, slept a while, and then discussed the assembled army—"the finest host that one had ever seen in Romania"—more than 900 Latin knights, 6,000 horse from Thessaly and Bulgaria, "and a good 30,000 foot." Nicholas assumed command of the army at the duke's request, and the next day they all took to the road. By evening they reached Thalasinson, where they spent the night, and where Nicholas and the other leaders took counsel as to the route they should take to Ianina, "where they had been told the despoina was, with all her host, to defend her country against the duke of Athens."¹⁷²

The next day they followed the well-worn road to Trikkala, which they reached in two days. Thereafter they passed by Kalambaka (Stagus), and reached a place which the chronicler calls "Serquices;" here they encamped, and were told they were a day's journey from Ianina, a three days' march for the army. The Despoina Anna's scouts had kept her informed of the duke's advance, and she could easily see that her situation did not call for a display of valor. She sent messengers to the Frankish camp at "Serquices," assuring the duke and the marshal of her good will toward them. She claimed that Phanarion had not been occupied "by her counsel or by her desire;" she offered to give the place up; "and for the expense which they had incurred in coming so far, she would give them 10,000 hyperperi . . . , 7,000 to the duke and 3,000 to the marshal." Since the Thessalian archontes as well as the Latin barons thought it was well thus to recover Phanarion without further effort, the despoina's offer was accepted, and peace was re-established with Epirus.¹⁷³

Both the Latins and Greeks felt, however, that so great an army should not have been assembled in vain "without doing something which was honorable." Under the circumstances the most honorable thing they could think of was to repay a petty grievance against the Byzantines in Macedonia, and so "they entered into the emperor's land, beyond the boundaries which divided the empire from Thessaly," overrunning

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pars. 881–89, 891–94, pp. 348–53. These events are dated in June, 1302 (*ibid.*, p. 401).

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, par. 895, p. 353, and Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, p. 284.

¹⁷² *Chronique de Morée*, ed. Longnon, pars. 896–902, pp. 353–56.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, pars. 903–7, pp. 356–57.

the picturesque countryside almost as far as Thessalonica, where the Empress Irene (Yolanda of Montferrat), the wife of Andronicus II, was residing at the time. Like the despoina, Irene sent two Latin knights and two Greek archontes as messengers to the duke of Athens and the marshal of the Morea. They brought rich gifts with them as well as the empress's remonstrance against this invasion of imperial territory since Andronicus had a "truce and good peace" with his Latin neighbors to the south. The messengers spoke frankly of "how the duke had no just cause to break the peace which he had sworn with the emperor," who had in any event given the empress, as her *chevance*, the city of Thessalonica and its appurtenances, and it did not become "such valiant men as they were and of such renown to make war upon women." She appealed to their knightly honor and courtesy, and after all were they not her kinsmen (*comme ses chiers parans que il estoient*). The duke, the marshal, and all the barons were much impressed with Irene's message; they could see that she was indeed a *noble et sage dame*; and they promptly decided they would cause her no further trouble. Thereupon they broke camp and marched back into Thessaly; the local archontes returned to their homes. When Guyot reached the Ellada, near the castle town of Zeitounion, the Negropontines took leave of him, and so did a number of others from Argos, Nauplia, and Athens. But Guyot, Nicholas of S. Omer, Thomas of Salona, and some other barons went to see the little John II in Neopatras, where they remained two days. Guyot spent some further time in the valley of the Ellada, taking seriously his duties as John's guardian. Nicholas of S. Omer spent one more week with him, "leading the good life," and then went back to the turmoil which Prince Philip of Savoy was creating in the principality of Achaea.¹⁷⁴

It is hard to believe that Guyot de la Roche's campaign in 1302 involved 30,000 footsoldiers. It may also be hard to believe that he withdrew from Thessalonica because the Byzantine empress, noble and sage lady that she was, appealed to his princely honor. But the theatrical display of virtue was part of the current fashion of knighthood, and if one sought to depict the sociology of Frankish Greece in terms of Max

Weber's ideal types, Guyot might be taken as a model for his time. He cultivated charm, practiced courtesy, and was given to ostentation. In May, 1304, he participated with dash and daring in the brilliant parliament summoned by Philip of Savoy to meet at Corinth, and in the long, flat plain, where the Isthmian games had once been held, Latin knights jostled for twenty days in long-remembered encounters under the approving eyes of the ladies. The French chronicler of the Morea says that Guyot came to Corinth *avec belle chevalerie*, and his chronicle comes to an end with the tournaments in which Guyot's prowess was tested and passed muster.¹⁷⁵

Some time after Charles II's favorite son Philip of Taranto was made prince of Achaea (in May, 1307), he appointed Duke Guyot de la Roche his bailie in the principality, perhaps to assuage Guyot's resentment that the hereditary claim of his wife Mahaut of Hainaut to the principality had not been honored by the Angevins. But Guyot did not exercise for long this authority in the Morea. He died on 5 October, 1308, in his twenty-eighth year, the last of an illustrious line. Wealth had apparently given him too abundant opportunities to indulge his large capacity for pleasure. The Greek chronicler of the Morea says he passed his life in debauchery. Guyot was buried the day after his death in the Cistercian abbey of Daphni, on the road from Athens to Eleusis. A beautiful marble sarcophagus, with Latin decorative motifs, including two fleurs-de-lys, may still be seen today under the colonnade in the courtyard at Daphni. Buchon believed it to have been the sarcophagus of Guyot, and it may well have once contained the body of one of the French dukes of Athens.¹⁷⁶ But of this, as of much else in the Burgundian history of Athens and Thebes, there can be no certainty.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pars. 1008, 1014-24, pp. 393-94, 396-99.

¹⁷⁶ *Greek Chronicle of Morea*, ed. Schmitt (1904), vv. 8047-55, p. 522; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio (1885), pars. 516-22, pp. 113-15; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85, pp. 367b-69a (repr., I, 301b-3a), and *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, p. 136; Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Commemoriali, Reg. 1, fol. 135^v, summarized in R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, I (Venice, 1876), no. 382, p. 89, a letter dated 13 October, 1308, from the Venetian councillors at Negroponte, reporting among other matters the death of the duke of Athens on the fifth; J. A. Buchon, *La Grèce continentale et la Morée*, Paris, 1843, pp. 131-33, on Guyot's death and burial; Millet, *Le Monastère de Daphni* (1899), pp. 38-40; Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, pp. 292-93.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pars. 908-18, pp. 357-62.

17. THE CATALANS AND FLORENTINES IN ATHENS TO THE END OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

GUYOT DE LA ROCHE was succeeded as duke of Athens by his nearest male relative, Gautier I [V], count of Brienne and Lecce, "and the said count," says the Aragonese chronicler of the Morea, "arrived at Glarentza [in the early summer of 1309] with two galleys to demand the heritage of the Athenian duchy because of the death of milord Guy de la Roche, his first cousin, stating that his mother had been sister of milord William de la Roche, father of the said lord Guy de la Roche, who was now dead."¹ Shortly after his accession to the ducal throne of Athens, Gautier de Brienne found himself in conflict with his Greek neighbors to the north, John II Ducas of Neopatras, Anna Palaeologina of Epirus, and the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II himself. In the spring of 1310 Gautier took the Catalan Grand Company into his employ to assist him against his new-found enemies.

The Catalans and Aragonese who formed the Grand Company had been thrown out of work when the treaty of Caltabellotta (of 31 August, 1302) brought to an end the first phase of the Angevin-Aragonese struggle which had begun twenty years before with the Sicilian Vespers. With the advent of peace, always a boon to citizens but a blow to mercenaries, Roger de Flor, a turncoat Templar, had organized the Company, for which he secured employment with Andronicus II and the latter's son and co-emperor Michael IX. The Catalans fought for the Byzantines with some success against the Turks in Asia Minor during the spring and early summer of 1304. At the end of April, 1305, however, Michael IX had Roger murdered; the Palaeologi had come to fear his prowess and his ambition; and now they found themselves at war with the Company. The Catalans had already taken over the Gallipoli peninsula, which they held for two years, and from which they pillaged the villages and the countryside to the north. In June, 1307, they began to move westward, burning and plundering their way through Thrace and Macedonia. Before the end of August, 1307,

they reached Cassandrea on the Chalcidic peninsula. During the spring and summer of 1308 they were harassing the monks of Mount Athos, and in the spring of 1309 they entered the plains of Thessaly, where Gautier found them a year later (a goodly number of Turks among them) conveniently at hand for use against the Ducae and the Palaeologi.²

For six months the Catalans helped Duke Gautier stay the aggression of the Greeks. They even won him some lands and castles in southern Thessaly, but when his need for them had passed, Gautier (like their former employers) tried to get rid of them, although he still owed them four months' wages. He chose from their ranks 200 horse and 300 foot; to these he paid what he owed; he promised to give them lands and to enroll them in his service. The others he told to be gone, but they had nowhere else to go, and claimed as fiefs some of the Thessalian conquests they had made. He would not accept their homage. The 500 chosen Catalans now abandoned Gautier, and rejoined their countrymen, whose grievances at this point could be settled only by the arbitrament of arms. On Monday, 15 March, 1311, the Catalans and their Turkish allies met Gautier near Halmyros to the northeast of Zeitounion (Lamia). The Catalans were victorious, presumably with the aid of the crossbow. Gautier was killed in the encounter, as were many other lords of Frankish Greece. The Catalans occupied Thebes, Livadia, and Athens. Many of the Turks are said to have been killed or sold into slavery as they tried to return to Asia Minor by way of Thessaly. "And so [the Catalans] divided amongst themselves," says the Catalan chronicler Muntaner, "the city of Thebes and all the towns and castles of the duchy [of Athens] and gave the ladies as wives to the men of the Company, to each according to his importance, and to some they gave so distinguished a lady that he was not worthy to hand her her bowl to wash her hands."³

¹ *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, ed. Alfred Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, pars. 538-39, p. 118.

² Cf. Roger Sablonier, *Krieg und Kriegertum in der Crònica des Ramón Muntaner*, Bern and Frankfurt am M., 1971, pp. 15 ff., and A. E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328*, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 134-83.

³ Ramón Muntaner, *Crònica*, chap. 240, ed. Karl Lantz,

However unworthy the honest Muntaner may have felt some of his countrymen to be of the noble wives they had thus acquired, the Catalan Grand Company now held the Athenian duchy by what they regarded as right of conquest. Early in 1312 they accepted, probably

Chronik des edlen En Ramon Muntaner, Stuttgart, 1844, pp. 429–31, trans. Lady Goodenough, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series, no. L, vol. II, pp. 575–78; *Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, pars. 546–54, pp. 119–21; *Chronicle of Morea* (Greek version), ed. John Schmitt, London, 1904, vv. 7270–7300 (MS. Copenhagen, pp. 472, 474; MS. Paris, pp. 473–75); and for other sources, with detailed references to George Pachymeres, Nicephorus Gregoras, Theodulus Magister, et al., see K. M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311–1388*, rev. ed., London: Variorum, 1975, pp. 3–12, and in general, cf. Setton, *Los Catalanes en Grecia*, Barcelona: Aymá, 1975, pp. 7 ff., 40–41.

Gautier I was defeated by the Catalans not on the marshy banks of the river Cephissus in Boeotia, as we are told by Muntaner and Gregoras, but near Halmyros in Thessaly, as stated by Marino Sanudo in a letter of March, 1327, which seems to have been unknown before its publication by Aldo Cerlini, "Nuove Lettere di Marino Sanudo il Vecchio," *La Bibliofilia*, XLII (1940), 321–59. Sanudo locates the battle "ad Almiro" (*ibid.*, p. 352), but his whole letter is most illuminating, and has escaped the notice of historians for decades. See David Jacoby, "Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Romanie (1305–1332): Un nouveau témoignage de Marino Sanudo Torsello," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., XV (1974), 223–30, and cf. Raymond J. Loenertz, *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel (1207–1390)*, Florence, 1975, pp. 121–22. Precise determination of the site of the battle is only slightly complicated by the fact that in the middle ages there were "two Halmyroi" (cf. Tafel and Thomas, *Urkunden*, I [1856, repr. 1964], doc. LXXXV, p. 266, dated November, 1199; A. Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romanie," *Studi veneziani*, VII [1965], 222). Although present-day Halmyros was established only at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it presumably lies on or near the sites of the two medieval Halmyroi (cf. N. I. Giannopoulos, "Christian Inscriptions of Thessaly" [in Greek], *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, XXIII [1899], 396 ff.; *idem*, "The Two Medieval Halmyroi and that of Today" [in Greek], *Epeteris Parnassou*, VIII [1904], 65–92; G. A. Soteriou, "Christian Thebes of Thessaly" [in Greek], *Archaiologikē Ephemeris*, 1929, pp. 5–6, note 2; and Carile, in *Studi veneziani*, VII, 284).

As for the crossbow, Muntaner says that "los Cathalans son los pus subirans ballesters del mon" (*Crònica*, chap. 130, ed. Lanz [1844], p. 244; ed. "E.B." [Enric Bogue], 9 vols., Barcelona, 1927–52, IV, 40). The statement is made in connection with naval warfare in the year 1285. Maybe Catalan crossbowmen were "the best in the world," but one must remember that Muntaner was very partial to his countrymen. At any rate their weapon was still a rather primitive device. Muntaner does not mention its use by the Catalan Company in 1311. Although the "crossbow" was known from antiquity (Hermann Diels, *Antike Technik*, 2nd ed., Leipzig and Berlin, 1920, pp. 94 ff.; A. R. Hall, "Military Technology," in Charles Singer et al., eds., *A History of Technology*, II [Oxford, 1956], 707–9), the steel crossbow with a pawl-and-ratchet winding

with some reluctance, the suzerainty of the Catalan King Frederick II of Sicily (1296–1337), and for more than forty years cadets of the Catalan-Sicilian royal family were to bear the title Duke of Athens. All told, some six to seven thousand Catalans and Aragonese, with a sprinkling of Italians among them, settled down in Attica and Boeotia. Thebes remained the capital of the Catalan duchy of Athens, as it had been under the Burgundians. In 1318 John II Ducas of Neopatras died, however, and the Catalans saw the opportunity for further conquest. Don Alfonso Fadrique, their greatest vicar-general and a natural son of Frederick II, seized the northern stronghold of the Ducae (in 1319) and the castle of Siderocastron (near the ancient Heraclea), together with Pharsala and Domokos in Thessaly. He also occupied the castle of Zeitounion (the ancient Lamia) and nearby Gardiki as well as Loidoriki to the west of Salona.⁴ Neopatras now became a second "duchy" under the Catalan-Sicilian Crown.

In this chapter for the most part we shall be concerned with the opposition of the Avignonese popes to the Catalan Company and with the difficulties the Venetians encountered in coming to terms with the Company. We shall also pay some attention to the affairs of the Latin hierarchy in the two duchies. But before proceeding further, it seems advisable to give a brief account of the political institutions under which the Catalans lived, and which they cherished until the close of their rule over Attica, Boeotia, and Phthiotis.⁵

mechanism to bend the bow, a lethal weapon, seems not to be earlier than the late fourteenth century (Hall, *ibid.*, p. 723, and cf. Lynn White, Jr., *Medieval Technology and Social Change*, Oxford, 1962, p. 111), and obviously it was not employed in the battle which won the Catalans the duchy of Athens.

⁴ Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Ep.* III (written in 1325), in Jacques Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 2 vols. in 1, Hanau, 1611, II, 293, and Antoni Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català*, Barcelona, 1947, doc. CXXIX, pp. 159–61 (commonly cited hereafter as *Dipl.*).

⁵ The history of the Catalan states in Greece, together with a discussion of the works of the great Catalan historian Antoni Rubió i Lluch (1855–1937), may be found in Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, referred to in a preceding note. Briefer accounts are given in Setton, "The Latins in Greece and the Aegean from the Fourth Crusade to the End of the Middle Ages," in the *Cambridge Medieval History*, IV, pt. 1 (1966), 411 ff., with an extensive bibliography, *ibid.*, pp. 908–38; "Catalan Society in Greece in the Fourteenth Century," in the volume dedicated to the late Basil Laourdas, Thessaloniki, 1975, pp. 241–84; and "The Catalans in Greece, 1311–1380," and "The Catalans

In their general Articles or Statutes (*Capítols*), written in Catalan, the Company had a veritable constitution, based largely upon the Customs of Barcelona. The text of these statutes has never been recovered, except for a few tantalizing fragments, especially that prohibiting gifts of land and bequests to the Church.⁶ The chief executive office in the duchies was held by the vicar-general (*vicarius generalis*), the chief military post by the marshal (*marescalcus exercitus ducatum*). The Catalan-Sicilian duke appointed the vicar-general, who swore fealty to him before departing for Athens or Thebes, where he took another oath before deputies of the Company to govern the duchies according to the statutes. The vicar-general was supposed to have appellate jurisdiction over both civil and criminal cases although appeals were often made to the ducal and royal court in Sicily and, after 1379–1380, in Aragon-Catalonia. He could remove and suspend officials from office, receive homage and fealty in the name of the sovereign duke, and (allegedly) make appointments to most offices in the duchies and determine the salaries to go with them.⁷

Despite the broad general powers thus given to a vicar-general, especially under unusual circumstances, it was the royal duke himself who usually made appointments to the chief offices of state, including that of marshal, but most such offices were reserved for prominent members of the Company, and in fact that of marshal, whether by ducal nomination or not, was held for almost two generations (until 1354?) by the important family of the Novelles. In Athens the Catalans managed their affairs as

a municipal corporation (*la universitat de Cetines*), with their own civil and military officers (*capità e veguer, castellà*) and their own syndics, aldermen, and municipal council (*sindichs, prohomens e consell dela dita universitat*). Neopatras was the capital of the northern duchy, within the boundaries of which stood the important castle town of Zeitounion (Lamia, in Catalan *la Cító*). A captain presided over the administration of justice in Neopatras; a castellan commanded the men-at-arms in the hilltop castle; and captain and castellan were often the same person in the capital city on the northern frontier. The duchy of Neopatras has much less history than that of Athens.

Most of our documents come from the royal chanceries in Sicily and Aragon-Catalonia. A large proportion of them relates to the ducal domain, which included the five municipalities (*universitats*) of Thebes, Athens, Livadia, Siderocastron, and Neopatras. The corporate bodies of the "citizens" (*cives*) of the municipalities, taken together, prolonged in many ways the concept of the original Company (*exercitus, societas, universitas Francorum*). An Aragonese document of 1380 refers to the "prelats, barons, universitats del ducat d'Atenes,"⁸ and Loenertz has described the Catalan municipalities in Greece as a "véritable organisation du tiers-état."⁹ The most important local officials in the duchies were the veguer (*vigerius, veguer*), the captain (*capitaneus, capità*), and the castellan (*castellanus, castellà*). The veguer and captain presided over the courts of first instance in the duchies. The office of veguer was imported into the Athenian duchy, as it had been into Catalan Sardinia, from the county of Barcelona, where it preserved the name and memory of the old Carolingian vicar (*vicarius*). Veguers heard both civil and criminal cases, and the documents reveal the names of a number of appointees to the office in Thebes, Athens, and Livadia, although the territorial extension of these veguerías remains unknown. Neopatras may also have constituted a veguería, but no record has survived of appointment to the office of veguer in the northern capital; comparable functions, however, were performed in both Neopatras and Siderocastron by the cap-

and Florentines in Greece, 1380–1462," in Setton and H. W. Hazard, eds., *A History of the Crusades*, III (Madison, Milwaukee, and London, 1975), 167–277. In dealing with the Catalans in the present work I have adopted or adapted a number of passages from these previous publications, and for repetitions of style, thought, and content I can only offer the reader an apology. Among the general histories of Catalonia, which might be mentioned by way of background, I would note only Ferran Soldevila, *Història de Catalunya*, 3 vols., Barcelona, 1934–35 (rev. ed., 1962), and J. Lee Shneidman, *The Rise of the Aragonese-Catalan Empire (1200–1350)*, 2 vols., New York, 1970.

⁶ Cf. *Dipl.*, docs. LIII, CCXCIV, pp. 67–69, 282–83, dated in 1312 (?) and 1367, and note also docs. CCCXCI, CDXXXIII, pp. 476–77, 508. Landed property and feudal revenues were to be reserved for *gens d'armes* who could defend the state.

⁷ The duties of the vicar-general, who is described as "viceroi and lieutenant" (*viceregius et locumtenens*), are outlined in a late document in Rubió i Lluch's *Diplomatari*, doc. CCCLXXIV, pp. 455–56, dated 13 September, 1379.

⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXC, p. 472.

⁹ R. J. Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatras: Regestes et notices pour servir à l'histoire des duchés catalans (1311–1394)," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXV (1955), 165.

tain, a title and office imported into the Greek states from Sicily, where there were no veguers. In Sicily captains heard both civil and criminal cases, but in the Greek duchies the captain heard only criminal cases, and the captaincy is thus linked in the documents with cognizance of such cases (*officium capitaneie cum cognicione causerum criminalium*).¹⁰

Although different in origin and properly in function, the vigeriate and captaincy were usually held in the Athenian duchy by one and the same person, who is called "veguer or captain"¹¹ and less often "veguer and captain."¹² The duties of the captaincy are carefully delineated in the appointment of John de' Bonacolsi as captain of Livadia,¹³ and those of the vigeriate in the appointment of Nicholas de Ardoino as veguer of Thebes.¹⁴ A council composed of a judge, an assessor, and a notary, all ducal appointees, assisted the veguer and captain in the exercise of his (or their) duties.¹⁵ The veguer and captain took an oath of fealty to the duke, including the promise to exercise his office "faithfully and legally," and he repeated the oath on the gospels before the syndics of the municipality in which he was to discharge his official duties. His term of office was limited by the statutes to a period of three years,¹⁶ although King Frederick III of Sicily, who was also duke of Athens (1355–1377), all too often made appointments to the offices of veguer and captain—and of castellan—"during the good pleasure of our Majesty." Against appointments of indefinite duration, however, the Catalan notables in the Athenian duchy not infrequently made such vigorous protest that Frederick removed (or tried to

remove) the incumbents, but it is sometimes difficult to determine from the documents what Frederick really wanted, for he was constantly blown this way and that by the strong winds of baronial opposition.

The castellany (*officium castellanie*) carried with it the guardianship of a castle and the command of its garrison. Various castles in the duchies were granted, as we should expect in a feudal society, as hereditary fiefs. King Frederick II declined "on many occasions" to grant his son, Don Alfonso Fadrique, the castle of Neopatras as a fief,¹⁷ but Alfonso held and his heirs held after him the castles of Salona, Zeitounion, and Loidoriki, while in June, 1366, his own son William Fadrique received the lifetime enfeoffment of the castle of Stiris,¹⁸ near the famous monastery of S. Luke. Although acknowledging the rights of the sovereign duke, the Catalan Company wanted to exercise some control over the larger communities, and sometimes sought confirmation of their own candidates for appointments to the castellanies (and vigeriates) lest under the guise of the duke's *beneplacitum* they should fall as quasi-fiefs into the hands of local barons. The documents bear witness to castellans in Athens, Livadia, Neopatras, and Siderocastron, which places were said to belong to the "royal domain" (*regium sacrum demanium*), and of course the king and the municipal corporations did not see eye to eye on the custody of their castles.¹⁹

The juridical concept of the Catalans' corporate organization as a Company survived until the end although the sense of its reality grew dimmer with the years, as the military corporation became more or less identified with the municipal governments in the two duchies. There were castellans at Salona and Viteranitzza besides those at Athens, Livadia, Neopatras, and Siderocastron, but there was none in the capital city of Thebes, possibly because the Catalans had destroyed the castle on the Cadmea in 1331 to prevent its seizure by Gautier II [VI] de Brienne when he made a

¹⁰ *Dipl.*, docs. CCLXIII, pp. 346–47; CCLXXIII, pp. 357–58; CCXCV, pp. 383–84; CCCXXXIII, pp. 420–21.

¹¹ *Dipl.*, docs. CCLXXXI, p. 365; CCLXXXIII, p. 367; CCLXXXVI, p. 371; CCCXXII, p. 410; CCCXXXIX, pp. 427, 428; CCCXLIV, p. 432; CCCXLV, p. 433; CCCXLVI, pp. 433, 434, *et alibi*: *capitaneus sive vigerius, vigerie seu capitaneie officium*.

¹² *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXIII, p. 357, *et alibi*: *officium vigerie et capitaneie*. Both the *and* and the *or* forms may occur in the same document (e.g., *Dipl.*, nos. CCCXXXIX, CCCXLI, CCCXLIV).

¹³ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXIII, pp. 346–47, dated 18 March, 1366. John de' Bonacolsi was appointed castellan of Livadia at the same time (*ibid.*, doc. CCLXIII).

¹⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCLV, pp. 441–42, dated 10 April, 1375; *cf.*, *ibid.*, docs. CCCLII, CCCLVI, CCCLXIV, and CCLXXXIII.

¹⁵ *Cf. Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXIII, p. 358.

¹⁶ *Cf. Dipl.*, doc. CCCXLIII, p. 431, dated 1374, *et alibi*: ". . . pro observancia capitulorum . . . ducatum que dictant expresse vigerios et castellanos eorumdem tantum per triennium in eisdem officiis duraturos. . . ."

¹⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CXLI, p. 172, a letter of Don Alfonso Fadrique to King Alfonso IV of Aragon-Catalonia (d. 7 January, 1336), dated at Thebes on 15 April with no indication of the year.

¹⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXVI, pp. 348–49.

¹⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXXIX, pp. 374–75, dated 1367, makes it clear that Livadia, Neopatras, and Siderocastron belonged to the royal domain, and doc. CCCXXXIV, p. 422, dated 1372, shows that the castle of Athens did so also.

costly but vain attempt to reconquer his father's duchy. It may be, however, that there was no place for a castellan in the city where both the vicar-general and the marshal of the Company had their residence.²⁰

Sometimes the offices of castellan, captain, and veguer were all held by a single person. Galcerán de Peralta, an important figure in the later history of Catalan Athens, held sway both on the Acropolis and in the lower city, as *castellà, capità e veguer del castell e ciutat de Cetines*, from some time before 1371 until 1379 despite Frederick III's attempts to remove him.²¹ Peralta thus discharged the chief military, judicial, and civil functions in the city, and no differentiation of his responsibilities was necessary or practicable. This might be convenient; circumstances might require it; but it was clearly injurious both to crown prerogatives and to citizens' rights. In Livadia, William de Almenara held multiple office just as Peralta did in Athens, and was equally hard to dislodge.²² Although the Crown and the "Company" might look askance at such pluralism, there was little which either could do about it. In the last decade of Catalan rule in Greece the nobles were taking over, and establishing lordships for themselves under the guise of office-holding, rather like the contemporary papal "vicars" in northern and central Italy.

In the grand enfeoffment of 1312, when the members of the Catalan Company placed themselves under the suzerainty of their former employer Frederick II, who appointed his second son, the five-year-old Don Manfred, as duke of Athens, they declared themselves to be his "true, faithful, and legitimate vassals . . . according to the laws of Aragon and the customs of Barcelona." They did so under certain "articles and conventions" in conformity with the contemporary idea of a contract between a ruler and his people, and on the young infante's behalf Frederick undertook to maintain all members of the Company "in the

state, office, or fief in which they are now."²³ Through the years, however, the relationship between the Crown and the Company was often uneasy. The Company had its own chancellor from the days of the chronicler Muntaner, who had himself held the office. The chancellor kept the Company's seal, which bore the effigy of S. George slaying the dragon. As duke of Athens and Neopatras, Frederick III recognized as proper the use of the seal by any one of the five municipalities on the royal domain in Greece, but he apparently objected to its employment as a symbol of the right of the Company to take action independently of the Crown.²⁴

To the house of Barcelona both in Sicily and in Aragon-Catalonia, the duchies of Athens and Neopatras were more a source of prestige than of income. The vicar-general administered the ducal revenues, which included certain crown rents and fees, taxes levied in the cities and country districts, various tolls and commercial imposts, and the feudal incidents and profits from the domain, part of which had belonged to the Burgundian dukes before the conquest, and part of which had been won by Don Alfonso Fadrique in 1318 and 1319. Later documents furnish us with some details of the ducal revenues. In Thebes the Crown possessed the right to certain ground rents, paid to the fisc each year in wax,²⁵ always a valuable commodity in the middle ages, and much of this so-called "census" in wax was clearly paid by the Armenian colony in Thebes for the shops and houses they leased from the ducal Curia.²⁶ The Curia also imposed a land

²³ *Dipl.*, doc. LIII, pp. 67–69.

²⁴ See in general David Jacoby, "La 'Compagnie catalane' et l'état catalan de Grèce," *Journal des Savants*, 1966, pp. 99–102.

²⁵ On 22 June, 1361, for example, Frederick III provided one Ferdinand de Zaguda with an annuity from the "census or tribute in wax" (*Dipl.*, doc. CCXLVI, p. 328; Sp. P. Lampros, *Eggrapha*, Athens, 1906, pt. IV, doc. 100, pp. 349–50). This document, incidentally, contains a reference to "certain houses constructed in the city of Thebes," the only known reference to new buildings in the Athenian duchy during the Catalan era. For other annuities to be paid from revenues accruing from the Theban census in wax, see *Dipl.*, docs. CCCX, CCCLIV, pp. 396–97, 440–41, dated 1368 and 1375, which are also given in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. IV, docs. 72, 52–53, 57, pp. 313, 291–92, 299.

²⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCLIV, pp. 440–41, dated 9 April, 1375: ". . . ex iuribus censualium debitorum et solvi consuetorum tam per Armenitos degentes in civitate Thebarum . . . quam per quoscumque alios habitantes in domibus nostre ducalis curie eiusdem civitatis Thebarum annis singulis in cera. . . ."

²⁰ The first appearance in the Catalan documents of a "castle of Thebes" (*castrum d'Estives*) comes as late as October, 1400 (*Dipl.*, doc. DCLXI, p. 687). Antoine Bon, "Forteresses médiévales de la Grèce centrale," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LXI (1937), 188–89, has suggested that the word *castrum* may mean only a fortified place in this text, like the Greek *kastro*, but this seems rather unlikely.

²¹ *Dipl.*, docs. CCCXXVIII, CCCXXXIII, CCCXLI, CCCXLVI, CCCLXXIII, CCCLXXVI, CCCLXXXIII.

²² *Dipl.*, docs. CCLXXIII, CCCXXV–CCCXXVII, CCCXXXIX, CCCXLIII–CCCXLV, CCCLXXII, CCCLXXXIII, CDLXXVII.

tax, to which reference is made in at least one document.²⁷ Greeks who accepted Roman Catholicism and thereafter reverted to their former faith suffered the confiscation of their property to the Crown,²⁸ which probably always regranted it to faithful retainers of the proper religious persuasion.

Ever since the papal-French alliance which had destroyed the Provençal-Catalan power of southern France in the Albigensian Crusade (in the early thirteenth century), Catalan foreign policy and Catalan ambitions on the Mediterranean had been watched with anxiety and suspicion in the Lateran Palace in Rome. On 30 August, 1301, a year before the settlement at Caltabellotta, Pope Boniface VIII had declared a tithe was to be paid, for three years, from all ecclesiastical revenues "in all parts of Italy and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, as well as the entire principality of Achaëa, the duchy of Athens, and the other islands adjacent thereto or the neighbors of the same." The purpose was to win back for the Angevins the island of Sicily which had been invaded and occupied in 1282 "by the late King Pedro [III] of Aragon with damnable temerity."²⁹ Pope Clement V and his successors in Avignon recognized the importance to the papacy, always going to be re-established in Rome, of the Angevin power which had rescued them from the Hohenstaufen; felt with impelling force their new connection with the monarchy in France; and looked with anxiety upon the machinations of Catalan kings in Barcelona and Palermo. The Brienne were a French family of distinguished ancestry, loyal Guelfs, and vassals of the Angevin princes of Achaëa. Inevitably the popes sought to aid young Gautier II de Brienne, son of the slain duke of Athens, to recover the classic heritage the Catalans had wrested from him in the battle of 15 March, 1311. Nevertheless, if in the confused pattern of interests and events in the Levant, some place could be found to employ the Company to the advantage of the Church, the Curia Romana would not be loath to do so.

When the Crusade was discussed at the Council of Vienne, the papal vice-chancellor proposed to the representatives of King James II of Aragon that the Catalan Company, now securely established in Thebes and Athens, should be employed in a crusading expedition which should pass through Greece, subject the schismatic Church to the Catholic faith, and proceed by way of Christian Armenia against the Moslems in the Holy Land. On 22 November, 1311, his Majesty was reminded of the strategic location, for purposes of the Crusade, of the Company, composed of Catalans and Aragonese now in Greece, already the conquerors of many lands.³⁰ But the Catalans and Aragonese had had too long an acquaintance with papal politics, too many Turkish friends, and too good a stroke of fortune in the duchy of Athens for them to embark on an expedition to the Holy Land. The problem of the Catalans in Greece had, therefore, to be met otherwise, for their activities were proving most injurious to the Angevins and to Latin ecclesiastics in both continental Greece and the Morea.

On 2 May, 1312, Pope Clement V wrote from Vienne to "his beloved sons, the Catalan Company in Romania," that Philip I of Taranto, prince of Achaëa, had lodged a complaint at the Curia Romana in Avignon to the effect that the Company had entered into "certain conventions and pacts" with enemies of the Catholic faith against the prince and his Moreote vassals. His Holiness ordered their immediate abandonment of these conventions and pacts, warning the Company that excommunication would be

²⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CCC, p. 388, properly dated 1362; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. IV, doc. 2, p. 234: "... soluto jure terragii nostram curiam contingente. . . ."

²⁸ *Cf. Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXIV, pp. 358-59; doc. CCXCII, pp. 380-81; *et alibi*.

²⁹ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 30, pp. 46-47, 48; G. Digard, ed., *Les Registres de Boniface VIII*, III (Paris, 1921), no. 4127, cols. 125-28.

³⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. LII, pp. 65-66: "... per vestres gens Cathalans et Aragoneses qui son ja en Romania qui han subjugades moltes terres. . . ." For some Catalan crusading ideas, especially those of Ramón Lull, see A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, London, 1938, pp. 74 ff.; A. Gotttron, *Ramón Lulls Kreuzzugsideen*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1912; and E. Allison Peers, *Ramón Lull*, London, 1929, *passim*. On the various plans and alliances which the kings of Aragon-Catalonia made for a crusade against Granada during the first third of the fourteenth century, see Joaquim Miret y Sans, "Negociacions diplomàtiques d'Alfons III de Catalunya-Aragó ab el rey de França per la croada contra Granada (1328-1332)," in the *Anuaris de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans*, 1908, pp. 265-336, with twenty-six documents, and Gottfried Dürrhofer, *Die Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johann XXII. (1316-1334)*, Strassburg, 1913, pp. 77-102; for the preceding century, see Robert Ignatius Burns, *The Crusader Kingdom of Valencia: Reconstruction on a Thirteenth-Century Frontier*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1967, and *Islam under the Crusaders: Colonial Survival in the Thirteenth-Century Kingdom of Valencia*, Princeton, N.J., 1973, with extensive bibliographies.

the price of their refusal. He notified the Company also that he was writing to Foulques de Villaret, master of the Hospital of S. John of Jerusalem, to help expel them from Romania if they failed to obey the apostolic admonition.³¹ On the same day Clement wrote to Villaret to the same effect.³² The Catalans, of course, did not desist; Villaret, however, made no effort to drive them from the Athenian duchy; he was too much occupied with the affairs of the Hospitallers on the newly acquired island of Rhodes. But conditions in Latin Greece were nearly intolerable, and complaints were continually coming to the Curia.

The revenues of the archbishopric of Corinth had been so much diminished, "because of the invasion and destruction of the city and district of Corinth, which is known to have been subjected to desolation by the Catalan Company," that in June, 1312, Bartholomew, the new archbishop, was granted a three years' extension of payment for certain debts contracted by his predecessor James at the Curia.³³ A month later the pope learned that the Catalans and Aragonese had inflicted so many tribulations upon the archdiocese of Thebes that Stephen, who had just become archbishop, could not take up residence in his see. Stephen was therefore granted the right to retain for two years all the benefices he had held before his promotion, for he found himself in such circumstances that he could neither "enjoy the fruits nor bear the burdens of archiepiscopal office."³⁴ The aged Gautier de Ray, bishop of Negroponte and a member of the family of the Burgundian dukes of Athens,³⁵ was granted a

three years' dispensation to reside outside his see, not only because of the debility of body which "odious old age" had brought upon him, but also because of the perils of the roads and the general insecurity which the Catalan Company had caused. Gautier had attended the Council of Vienne, and was still somewhere in southern France.³⁶

Pope Clement V could not but feel that the cause of Latin Christendom in Greece had been severely hurt by the advent of the Catalans, for Duke Gautier I had been a loyal son of Mother Church, an assiduous defender of the faith (*solers christiane fidei propugnator*).³⁷ On 14 January, 1314, therefore, Clement had reason for his indignant letter to Nicholas, the Latin patriarch, excoriating the Catalan Company for their attacks upon churches, ecclesiastics, and their fellow Christians, and for the death of Gautier I de Brienne, "who had been laboring in defense of the faithful like a true athlete of Christ and a faithful boxer of the Church against the Greek schismatics."³⁸ On the same day the pope wrote the patriarch that he should effect the transfer of such properties as the Knights Templars had possessed in the duchy of Athens to Gaucher de Châtillon, constable of France and grandfather of the titular duke Gautier II, in order that, it is declared, such properties may be used to defend the faithful against schismatics "and certain other characters in a certain Company" (*et quidam alii viri cuiusdam Societatis*).³⁹ The fourteenth of January, 1314, was a busy day for clerks in the papal chancery. Clement wrote again to Foulques de Villaret, master of the Hospitallers, whom he directed to place at the disposal of the Constable de Châtillon three or four armed galleys, to be maintained for three months at the expense of the Hospital, to assist in the defense of certain castles and towns which the Catalan Company had not yet been

³¹ *Dipl.*, doc. LVI, pp. 71-72; *Regestum Clementis Papae V*, Rome, 1885-1888, annus septimus, no. 7890, pp. 72-73.

³² *Dipl.*, doc. LVII, p. 72; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus septimus, no. 7891, p. 73.

³³ *Dipl.*, doc. LVIII, p. 73; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus septimus, no. 8597, p. 238.

³⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. LIX, pp. 73-74, dated at the priory of Le Groseau on 13 July, 1312; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus septimus, no. 8138, p. 125; and cf. R. J. Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatras: Regestes et documents pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique . . .," *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII (1958), no. 7, p. 32. Stephen received the pallium on VI Kal. Sept. anno septimo (27 August, 1312), according to the *Diplomatari*, doc. LI, p. 65, where the papal letter is misdated 8 September, 1311; it is correctly dated 27 August in the *Reg. Clem. V*, annus septimus, no. 8489, p. 211, and misdated 12 August in Loenertz, *op. cit.*, no. 8, p. 32.

³⁵ Cf. in general J. Gauthier, "Othon de la Roche, conquérant d'Athènes et sa famille (1217-1335)," *Académie des sciences, belles-lettres, et arts de Besançon*, 1880, pp. 139-55. The letter of Clement V to Bishop Gautier, dated 23 March,

1313, refers to "quondam Galterus, dux Athenarum, de cuius genere originem traxisse diceris" (*Dipl.*, doc. LXII, p. 77).

³⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. LXII, pp. 77-78; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus octavus, no. 9153, pp. 131-32.

³⁷ Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 31, p. 52, dated 11 November, 1310; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus quintus, no. 5768, p. 235.

³⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. LXIV, pp. 80-81; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus nonus, no. 10167, p. 45; Raynaldus, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 1314, no. 9 (vol. V [1750], p. 22); Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 32, p. 53; and cf. *Dipl.*, doc. LXVI, p. 83, *et alibi*.

³⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. LXIII, pp. 78-79; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus nonus, no. 10166, pp. 44-45.

able to capture.⁴⁰ Another letter bearing the same date was dispatched to King James II of Aragon—"since the greater part of the Company is said to have been recruited from your kingdom"—asking his Majesty to warn and to exhort the Catalans to give up the castles and the lands they had occupied.⁴¹ According to the seventeenth-century annalist of the kings of Aragon, Pedro Abarca, King James II replied that his Holiness would do well to look upon the Catalans and Aragonese in Greece as "the right arm and faithful instrument" of the Holy See, which might be employed against the schismatic Greeks.⁴² Be that as it may, on 28 February, 1314, James II wrote directly to the Catalan Company, expressing a desire to recall them "to the path of righteousness," and ordering "that you desist completely from the invasion and occupation of the duchy of Athens, and that, withdrawing therefrom completely, you leave it peacefully and quietly to its rightful heirs."⁴³ Four weeks later, long before the Catalans in Athens could have received his first letter, the king wrote again to the Company, ordering them to abandon the duchy of Athens.⁴⁴ These letters, however, were apparently nothing more than a diplomatic gesture. His true sentiments were certainly those which Fr. Abarca attributes to him.

The Venetians were as much concerned with the activities of the Catalan Company as was the French papacy in Avignon. In 1317 envoys of the Republic in Avignon were apparently instructed to inform Pope Clement's successor, John XXII, that an offensive league composed

of King Robert of Naples, the Angevin princes, the Constable de Châtillon, and the Hospitalers might expel the "Societas Catellanorum" from their recent conquests by landing a cavalry force in Attica.⁴⁵ In April, 1318, however, when representatives of the Constable de Châtillon and his daughter, the widow of Gautier I, presented a petition to the Doge Giovanni Soranzo—they sought a large loan and ships enough to transport four or five hundred knights and a thousand or more infantry to Negroponte or Nauplia—the doge replied that the Briennist feudatories of Argos and Nauplia were now allied with the Catalan Company, and since their own vassals were not loyal, their proposal would be but a vain expenditure of men and money.⁴⁶

Perhaps the Venetians were beginning to believe that they could deal with the Catalans, but Pope John XXII would not hear of any compromise with them. On 8 May, 1318, he wrote Soranzo and the Signoria of Venice, urging the expulsion of the Catalans from the island of Negroponte, where Don Alfonso Fadrique held the fortress towns of Carystus and Larmena as his wife's dowry. The pope claimed that Alfonso aimed at the occupation of the entire island and, which was quite true, that he had Turks in his employ; the Venetians should expel the Catalans not only from Negroponte, but from the duchy of Athens also, in which business, the pope indicates, his beloved son King Robert of Naples had some interest.⁴⁷ On 18 June (1318), Alfonso himself wrote a letter from Athens to the captain and bailie of Negroponte, expressing his astonishment that Catalans from the Athenian duchy had been guilty of depredations against the Venetians, "with whom we have a truce and are at peace." He promised an investigation and the punishment of the offenders; he desired peace with the Venetians, of whom, however, he was clearly suspicious.⁴⁸ But Venetian diplomacy had already borne some fruit.

⁴⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. LXV, pp. 81–82; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus nonus, no. 10168, pp. 46–47. Unfortunately the papal letter does not identify these *castra et loca*, but they were presumably in the Argolid.

⁴¹ *Dipl.*, doc. LXVI, pp. 82–83; H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, II (1908), 749–51.

⁴² *Los Anales históricos de los reyes de Aragón*, II (Salamanca, 1684), cap. 6, nos. 7–9, pp. 61^v–62^v, quoted in Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* (1975), p. 26. Rubió i Lluch searched in vain for the text of King James's alleged reply in the Arch. Cr. Aragon in Barcelona (*Dipl.*, p. 84, note), but it would seem to have been rather in accord, as James might have reminded the pope, with the papal vice-chancellor's own observation of the possible usefulness of the Company against non-Catholics in the East (*Dipl.*, doc. LII, p. 66).

⁴³ *Dipl.*, doc. LXVII, p. 84. On the same day James II wrote Philip the Fair of France of his "vehement displeasure" at the Catalan conquest and of his orders to the Catalans to abandon the duchy of Athens to its rightful heirs (*Dipl.*, doc. LXVIII, pp. 84–85).

⁴⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. LXXII, p. 90, dated 27 March, 1314, and *cf.*, *ibid.*, doc. LXXIII, p. 91.

⁴⁵ Cf. Giuseppe Giomo, *I "Misti" del Senato della Repubblica veneta, 1293–1331*, Venice, 1887, repr. Amsterdam, 1970, p. 11, and *Archivio veneto*, XVII (1879), 136, extract from the rubrics of the lost fifth register of the *Misti*. These rubrics were republished by R. Cessi and P. Sambin, eds., *Le Deliberazioni del Consiglio dei Rogati (Senato), serie "Mistorum," I (libri I–XIV)*, Venice, 1960 (*cf.* above, Chapter 9, note 81).

⁴⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. XCIII, pp. 112–13.

⁴⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. XCIV, pp. 113–14.

⁴⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. XCV, pp. 114–15; *Byzantis*, II (1911–1912), 298–99. Catalan piracy was unceasing, however, among the

On 2 September, 1318, King Frederick II of Sicily answered the several grievances which a Venetian envoy had laid before him.⁴⁹ Very likely Frederick had already warned his son Alfonso to be careful, but the Sicilian archives are very fragmentary for this period. In any event the king refused to recognize as infractions of the peace or as unjust most of the acts charged against Don Alfonso, and his replies to the Venetian envoys are full of Catalan enmity towards the Angevin lords of Achaea.⁵⁰ With the Venetians, however, the king of Sicily desired amicable relations and the settlement of differences existing between them, and he appointed envoys to treat with the doge and Republic of Venice "to achieve a final peace and concord or a long truce between the Republic of Venice, her citizens and subjects, and Alfonso and the Catalan Company [*universitas exercitus Franchorum*]."⁵¹

Such a truce was finally initiated, after detailed negotiations, at a conference held at Negroponte on 9 June, 1319, between Don Alfonso and the whole Company on the one hand and, on the other, the Venetian bailie, his councillors, and the feudal lords of Negroponte. The truce was to last until Christmas.

islands of the Archipelago (cf. *Dipl.*, docs. xcvi, c-cii); see W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, trans. Furcy Raynaud, I (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Amsterdam, 1967), 538. On 26 June the bailie of Negroponte wrote the doge at length of Catalan piracy, and declared that he knew of at least two armed ships in Piraeus, which were about to transport two Catalan envoys to the Byzantine court and two others to the emirs of Asia Minor, in *Turchiam* (*Dipl.*, doc. xcvi, pp. 117-19): "... habuimus pro certo per personam fide dignam quod Athenis armatum est unum lignum a quadraginta octo remis . . . , quod armatur Athenis etiam unum aliud lignum. . . ."

⁴⁹ On 13 April, 1318, Giovanni Soranzo had informed King Robert of Naples, Prince Philip of Taranto, and John of Gravina, then prince of Achaea, that he had sent an envoy to Sicily (*Dipl.*, doc. xcii, p. 111). The king and his two brothers had complained to Venice of Don Alfonso's continued offences against them as well as against the Republic (*ibid.*, docs. lxxxix-xci, and cf. doc. xcvi).

⁵⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. ciii, pp. 124-27; G. M. Thomas, ed., *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum*, I (Venice, 1880, repr. New York, 1965), no. 64, pp. 110-13; cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination*, p. 34.

⁵¹ *Dipl.*, doc. civ, pp. 127-28; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 65, pp. 113-14. The Venetian conditions of peace presented to the Sicilian envoys in the early winter of 1318 and the doge's statement of terms for the envoys to take to Frederick II are printed in Rubió, *Dipl.*, docs. cvi-cvii, pp. 129-31, and in Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, nos. 66-67, pp. 115-17. The doge insisted that the Catalans could not maintain vessels equipped with oars (*ligna a remis*) in the Athenian duchy (Rubio, *op. cit.*, p. 130).

Alfonso and the Company agreed neither to arm nor even to maintain vessels in the Saronic Gulf or the waters around Negroponte. Such vessels as the Catalans already possessed were to be put in dry dock, a plank was to be removed from the bottom of every hull, and all tackle was to be stored on the Acropolis. The Catalans might use the Corinthian Gulf for such unarmed shipping as they then had; they were to receive no corsairs in the Athenian duchy; and they bound themselves to the payment of a fine of 5,000 hyperperi for any infraction of the terms of the truce.⁵² The treaty was renewed in May, 1321, and again at a meeting held in Thebes in April, 1331,⁵³ and both times the Company held itself as still liable to the fine for violation of its pledges, which now contained a half-dozen or more additional clauses to the effect that the Catalans should conclude no further alliances with the Turks, and should not in any way aid them in attacks upon the island of Negroponte or the Venetian possessions in the Archipelago.⁵⁴ As time went on, this treaty was often renewed or confirmed, once even for twenty years, although the Catalans and Venetians frequently had occasion to accuse each other of breaking it.⁵⁵ The Republic had a better record in this connection than the Company, but of course it was the Venetians who profited from the treaty, and they always insisted that the Catalans should not maintain armed vessels in Piraeus.

Papal opposition to the Catalan Company continued with undiminished vigor, and on 4 September, 1318, when the negotiations between the Catalan king of Sicily and the Venetians were far advanced, the Cardinal Bishop Nicholas of Ostia and Velletri wrote to the doge and council of Venice of the disquieting news that the Curia was continually receiving from Greece about the Catalans.⁵⁶ According to Karl Hopf, however, who cites a Venetian document of 6 December, 1317, Don Alfonso Fadrique had already withdrawn from the capital and island of Negroponte, retaining only the dis-

⁵² The text of the treaty of 1319 has often been printed, most recently in Rubió i Lluch's *Diplomatari*, doc. cix, pp. 132-34.

⁵³ *Dipl.*, docs. cxvi, cliii, pp. 141-44, 196-200.

⁵⁴ *Dipl.*, docs. cxvi, cliii, pp. 142, 198.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Dipl.*, doc. cclviii, pp. 341-42, dated 25 July, 1365, and Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* (1975), pp. 34-35, 60-61.

⁵⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. cv, p. 128.

puted castles of Carystus and Larmena.⁵⁷ Catalan and Turkish piracy could not be checked,⁵⁸ but hostilities with the Venetians on a serious scale seem not to have been renewed after Don Alfonso's withdrawal from Negroponte, and, as we have seen, he claimed in June, 1318, to be observing the "truce and peace" which the Company already had with the Venetians. An entente between the Catalans and Venetians found little favor at the Curia Romana, and on 2 August, 1319, about the time the news of the Catalan-Venetian peace of June became known in Avignon, Pope John XXII wrote to Gautier de Foucherolles (1311–1324), Briennist advocate in Argos and Nauplia, and to the people and clergy of the Argolid diocese, urging continued loyalty to young Gautier II and his mother the duchess of Athens.⁵⁹ The Brienne were clearly going to need all the local support they could find, for the years following 1318–1319 were the most secure and successful the Catalans were to enjoy in Greece. Muntaner has described Don Alfonso Fadrique's arrival in Piraeus with ten galleys. A king's son, able and aggressive, Alfonso was the most important Catalan ever to take up residence in the Athenian duchy, where he sometimes lived in Athens, doubtless in the Burgundian palace on the Acropolis.⁶⁰ He was soon accepted as a friend and ally by the great Lombard magnate Boniface of Verona, triarch of Negroponte, who probably gave him his daughter Marulla (Maria) in marriage in 1317:

And they [the Catalans] were very content and soon procured a wife for him [Fadrique], and gave him to wife the daughter of micer Bonifazio of Verona, to whom had been left all micer Bonifazio possessed, namely the third part of the city and of the town and of the island of Negroponte, and full thirteen castles on the mainland of the duchy of

Athens [which Boniface had received as fiefs from the Burgundian Duke Guy II de la Roche]. . . .⁶¹ And by this lady En [Catalan for Don] Alfonso Federico had plenty of children and she was the best lady and the wisest there ever was in that country. And, assuredly, she is one of the most beautiful Christians of the world; I saw her in the house of her father when she was about eight years old. . . .⁶²

When Boniface of Verona died in the late fall of 1317, Don Alfonso was ready to press his wife's claims to her paternal inheritance, and had promptly occupied Boniface's castles of Carystus and Larmena on the island of Negroponte. Thomas or Tommasaccio of Verona, who seems (for whatever reason) to have been virtually disinherited by his father, also claimed the castles of Larmena and Carystus. Thomas was a Venetian citizen, but as envoys of King Frederick II informed the Venetian government, Boniface of Verona had held these castles as fiefs from Jean de Noyer de Maisy, and the latter had recognized Marulla's right to them, and formally invested her with them, deciding against the claims of Thomas, while the latter is expressly declared to have accepted this judgment.⁶³ Pope John XXII, however, protested that Thomas of Verona had been despoiled of his inheritance,⁶⁴ while the Venetians, who looked with fear upon the Catalan possession of Carystus and Larmena, demanded their surrender to the Republic, promising somewhat ambiguously to do full right and justice to the claims of Marulla.⁶⁵ Don Alfonso kept possession of Carystus, although the Venetians seem to have acquired Larmena. Later on, they restored some villages on the island of Negroponte (around Larmena) to Thomas of Verona. When the latter died about February, 1326, his sister Marulla claimed his holdings. When Marulla and, conceivably, Don Alfonso sought to enter the city of Negroponte on 1 March to do homage to the triarchs Pietro dalle Carceri, Beatrice de

⁵⁷ Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, *Encykl.*, vol. 85 (1867), p. 413 (repr. 1960, I, 347), which is probably accurate, but rather hard to reconcile with the doge's letter to the Angevin princes of 13 April, 1318, which suggests that some doubt obtained in the ducal mind as to Venetian success in controlling Don Alfonso through exerting pressure upon his father (cf. Rubió, *Dipl.*, p. 111). Hopf's account seems to indicate that negotiations were rather more advanced than might be assumed from the documents of 2 September, 1318 (cf. Hopf, *op. cit.*, vol. 85, p. 415 [repr. I, 349], and Rubió's *Dipl.*, docs. CIII–CIV).

⁵⁸ Cf. *Dipl.*, docs. C–CI, dated 16 and 26 July, 1318.

⁵⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CX, pp. 134–35; G. Mollat and G. de Lesquen, eds., *Jean XXII (1316–1334): Lettres communes*, II (Paris, 1905), no. 9879, p. 421.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Dipl.*, doc. xcvi, p. 117, dated 26 June, 1318: ". . . dominus Alfonsus, qui est Athenis. . . ."

⁶¹ Cf. Hopf, *Storia di Karystos*, trans. G. B. Sardagna, Venice, 1856, pp. 32–34; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85, p. 412 (repr. I, 346).

⁶² Muntaner, *Crònica*, chap. 243 (ed. Lanz, pp. 434–35; trans. Hakluyt Society, II, 582), Muntaner's last reference to the Catalans in the Athenian duchy (cf. Rubió i Lluch, *Paquimeres i Muntaner* [1927], p. 22).

⁶³ *Dipl.*, doc. CIII, p. 126; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I (1880), no. 64, pp. 112–13.

⁶⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. xciv, pp. 113–14. Cf. Loenertz, *Les Ghisi* (1975), pp. 138–41.

⁶⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. cvi, p. 129; Thomas, *Dipl. ven.-levant.*, I, no. 66, p. 115.

Noyer de Maisy, and Bartolommeo II Ghisi, all three refused the lady, who had come *cum magno comitatu armatorum*, admittance to the city to do them homage for these lands and fiefs; because the island was, as they wrote the doge, under the protection of Venice, and since they feared the consequences of Catalan possession of such strongholds on Negroponte, the Signoria would have to declare the policy to be followed.⁶⁶ But the Venetians were not minded to make concessions to the Fadriques, because although major hostilities were avoided, it was well known in Venice that Catalan-Turkish piracy was an almost undiminished menace. As for the castle town of Carystus, Venice did not secure it from the Fadrique family until 1365–1366.⁶⁷

As for Don Alfonso, he became the lord of Salona under circumstances we do not know, but possibly the fief had escheated to the Company upon the deaths, without heirs, of Roger Deslaur and his wife, the widow of Thomas III d'Autremencourt. Don Alfonso

⁶⁶ *Dipl.*, docs. CXXX–CXXXII, pp. 161–64, dated 3–4 March, 1326; cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85 (1867), pp. 413, 415, 416, 425 (repr. 1960, I, 347, 349, 350, 359). In December, 1326, the Senate directed the bailie of Negroponte not to allow Marulla and her husband to enter the city (R. Cessi and P. Sambin, *Le Deliberazioni del Consiglio dei Rogati [Senato] serie "Mistorum,"* I [1960], nos. 38–40, pp. 326–27). See in general Jacoby, in *Studi medievali*, 3rd. ser., XV (1974), 242–43, 248–51, who does not believe that Thomas of Verona had been disinherited, and cf. Loenertz, *Les Ghisi* (1975), pp. 114–15, 146–49.

⁶⁷ Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Ep.* xvi (written in 1326), in Jacques Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, II (Hanau, 1611), 307: “. . . scripsi seriatim periculum quod incumbit terris et insulis subiectis principatui Amoreae tam per Turchos quam per illos de Compagna, qui tenent ducatum Athenarum. . . .” Sanudo's reference is obviously to the Turks of the Anatolian emirates, of whom he writes in *Ep.* xvii (1327), in Bongars, II, 309: “Turchi etiam, pessimi Saraceni, qui morantur in minori Asia, infestant valde insulas Romaniae, et maxime insulas quae pertinent ad principatum Achaiae.” Note also *Ep.* v (1326), in Bongars, II, 298, in which Sanudo also dilates on the danger presented to the islands by the Turks and Catalans, against whom Venetian Negroponte needed especial protection. Sanudo alludes to the Turkish problem a number of times, and incidentally laments the Hospitallers' traffic with Christian pirates on the island of Rhodes (*Ep.* xxi, in Bongars, II, 314, dated 15 February, 1329). Cf. the letter of Sanudo in Cerlini, *La Bibliofilia*, XLII (1940), 350, and Jacoby, in *Studi medievali*, XV, 251–54.

On the Venetians' (later) purchase of Carystus, alluded to in the text, see Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 31, fol. 129^v, dated 19 January, 1366 (Ven. style 1365), and *Lettere segrete del Collegio* (1363–1366), fol. 182^r, dated 1 February, 1366. The *castrum Caristi* cost the Republic 6,000 ducats.

probably possessed, in the north, the castles of Pharsala, Domokos, Zeitounion, and Gardiki, and in the south he certainly held those of Loidoriki and Veteranitza. Like Neopatras, Siderocastron was a crown property. The decade of the 1320's was the period of Don Alfonso's power and success. He was vicar-general from 1317 to about 1330; why he was removed from office we do not know. On 20 November, 1330, he was made hereditary count of Malta and Gozo in the mid-Mediterranean.⁶⁸ From his wife Marulla he had received the lordship of Aegina and the fortress city of Carystus on the island of Negroponte. Marulla also gave him five sons, all of whom were to play important parts in the history of the Catalan duchy of Athens. Don Alfonso's countrymen had a bad reputation throughout Greece and the islands. Many of them were pirates and slave traders. A Venetian who disembarked from a Catalan ship at the port of S. Niccolò (the modern Aulaimon), on the east coast of the island of Cerigo, observed to a herdsman whom he met, “Stay clear of these Catalans, because they're a bad lot. . . .”⁶⁹

Sometime within the fourth or early fifth decade of the century the Catalans lost Don Alfonso's northern conquests—the fortress towns of Pharsala, Domokos, and Gardiki—and after the successes of the Serbs and Albanians under the Serbian Tsar Stephen Dushan, who in 1348 overran Thessaly as well as Epirus, they had no chance of recovering them.⁷⁰ But the Catalans held on to the city of Neopatras until 1390, when it succumbed to a siege by one “Micer Arner,” undoubtedly the

⁶⁸ Cf. *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXCIII, pp. 482–85. The last document to refer to Don Alfonso as vicar-general, *praesidens in ducatu Athenarum*, is dated 4 March, 1326 (*ibid.*, doc. CXXXII, pp. 163–64).

⁶⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CXLVII, p. 184, dated 13 July, 1329: “Custodias te ab istis Catellanis, quia ipsi sunt mali homines, quia habent eius lignum caricatum de sclavis eundo furando per insulas.”

⁷⁰ Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, no. 10, p. 105, notes that Pharsala, Domokos, and Gardiki do not occur in Catalan documents relating to the duchies, and so must have been lost early. Liconia also does not appear in the documents. As Marino Sanudo notes, however, in his letter of March, 1327, the Catalans held as of that date the city of Neopatras, “which is an archiepiscopal see and, as it were, the capital of Thessaly” (*Blachia*), Loidoriki, Pharsala, Domokos, the hinterland of Halmyros, Siderocastron, Zeitounion, and Gardiki (A. Cerlini, “Nuove Lettere di Marin Sanudo,” *La Bibliofilia*, XLII [1940], 351).

Florentine Nerio Acciajuoli, to whom Athens had fallen two years before.⁷¹

Twenty years after his father's defeat and death young Gautier II [VI] de Brienne tried to recover the lost duchy of Athens. His mother Jeanne de Châtillon and her father the constable of France had kept his interests constantly before the pope, the king of Naples, the doge of Venice, and the king of France. The loss of the duchy had entailed great expense, and in the years that followed, it had caused in the family of Brienne "controversy and dissension." When he came of age, young Gautier II claimed that he should receive from his mother his lands "quit and free of all debts," but his mother protested that the burden of expense had been too great for her to do so. In January, 1321, King Philip V of France adjudicated the dispute between them: Gautier was to pay up to 7,000 *livres tournois*, and his mother the remainder, of the Brienne debts contracted "over the sea."⁷² Pope John XXII stood ready to assist Gautier to regain the duchy, "which is [his] ancient and patrimonial heritage," and on 14 June, 1330, as Gautier was preparing an expedition against the Catalans, the pope promulgated a crusading bull on his behalf. The Latin patriarch of Constantinople and the archbishops of Otranto, Corinth, and Patras were directed to preach a crusade, with "that full forgiveness of all their sins" to those who participated, against the Catalans, "schismatics, sons of perdition, and pupils of iniquity, devoid of all reason, and detestable."⁷³ On 21 July, 1330, King Robert of Naples granted permission to his feudatories to join Brienne's projected expedition against the Catalan Company in the duchy of Athens and, with some

reservations, remitted the feudal service due the royal court to those who fought with Brienne, *armis et equis decenter muniti*.⁷⁴ On 12 October King Robert published throughout his kingdom the papal bull (of 14 June) announcing the crusade.⁷⁵

In April, 1331, the Venetians renewed their treaty with the Catalans, and gave Gautier little encouragement and no assistance as he gathered his forces at Brindisi in August. His expedition began well enough. As vicar of the prince of Taranto, into whose family he had married, Gautier occupied the island of Santa Maura (Leukas), the mainland stronghold of Vonitza, and Arta, capital of the despotate of Epirus, forcing Count John II Orsini of Cephalonia to acknowledge the suzerainty of King Robert. But when he crossed the peninsula to Attica and Boeotia, the Catalans would not meet his French knights and Tuscan foot in combat. They remained on the Acropolis and behind the battlements of the lower city of Athens, and although they destroyed the castle of S. Omer (of which one square tower still remains) on the Cadmea, lest he should succeed in taking it, Gautier apparently failed even to penetrate the crenelated walls of Thebes. He ravaged the open country, but his funds were running out. On 28 February, 1332, in the Franciscan church of S. Nicholas in Patras, where Gautier had probably established his headquarters, Archbishop Guglielmo Frangipani (1317–1337) again proclaimed the ban of excommunication against the Catalans.⁷⁶ Gautier found no support anywhere among the native Greeks, who saw no reason to prefer French to Catalan domination. The expedition was a costly failure, and Gautier returned to Brindisi in the late summer of 1332, loaded with debt. He had won for himself Leukas and Vonitza, restored for years the Angevin suzerainty over Epirus, and probably made more secure his hold upon his fiefs of Argos and Nauplia in the Morea.

Gautier never returned to Greece, but during the years 1334 and 1335 he talked of another expedition against the Catalan usurpers of his duchy, and again the Avignonese

⁷¹ On the Catalan loss of Neopatras, cf. *Dipl.*, docs. DCXXVI–DCXXVII, pp. 656–57, dated 3 January, 1330.

⁷² H. D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Catalogue d'actes des comtes de Brienne (950–1356)*, Paris, 1872, no. 216, p. 45; André Duchesne, *Histoire de la maison de Châtillon*, Paris, 1612, *Preuves*, p. 212; Rubió, *Dipl.*, doc. CXII, pp. 136–37, with the erroneous date 1320 (*anno Domini MCCCXX mense januario* is dated O.S.). On the alleged portrait of Gautier II de Brienne in the chapel of S. Giovanni Evangelista in the lower church of S. Francis at Assisi, see Giuseppe Gerola, "Giovanni e Gualtieri di Brienne in S. Francesco di Assisi," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum*, XXIV (1931), 330–40.

⁷³ *Dipl.*, docs. CL, CLII, pp. 189–91, 193–94. The ecclesiastical ban levied upon the Catalans did not apply to the lands such as Neopatras and Zeitounion which they had conquered from the Greeks in 1318–1319.

⁷⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. CLI, pp. 191–92; G. Guerrieri, *Gualtieri VI di Brienne, duca di Atene e conte di Lecce*, Naples, 1896, p. 57.

⁷⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. CLII, pp. 192–96, dated 22 November, 1330.

⁷⁶ Chas. Du Cange, *Histoire de l'empire de Constantinople*, ed. J. A. Buchon, II (Paris, 1826), 203; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85, pp. 429–30, and cf. pp. 420–21 (repr., I, 363–64, and cf. pp. 354–55).

Curia did what it could to help him. On 12 August, 1334, Pope John XXII authorized a vitriolic bull of excommunication of the Catalans,⁷⁷ which was sent to Archbishop Guglielmo Frangipani of Patras. On 29 December, 1335, Guglielmo published the bull against the leaders of the Catalan Company—Duke William of Randazzo; Don Alfonso Fadrique and his sons Pedro and James; Nicholas Lancia, the vicar-general of the Company; Odo de Novelles, the marshal; and more than a score of others.⁷⁸ Success depended upon Venice, however, and on 4 November, 1335, the Signoria refused, with expressions of their profound love, to help him, although this time they offered him the use of state galleys to Glarentza or to his lands in the Morea,⁷⁹ doubtless knowing that he could not afford another expedition.

Although Gautier's chances of recovering the Athenian duchy became ever more remote with the passing years, he took whatever opportunities he could to remind both the doge and the pope of his claim to the duchy and of the iniquity of the Catalans.⁸⁰ But the independent archbishop of Thebes, the Dominican Isnard Tacconi, whom Clement V had made titular patriarch of Antioch (in 1311) and John XXII had returned to Thebes in 1326,⁸¹ had seen a good deal of both the French and the Catalans in Greece, and he clearly had no desire to see Gautier regain the duchy. Isnard had Ghibel-

line sympathies, dating from his days in Pavia, and was hostile to Gautier, who in March, 1337, denounced him to Pope Benedict XII, and requested the renewal of censure against the Catalan Company.⁸² Two years later, after further enquiry, Benedict not only acceded to Gautier's request, but ordered the vicars of "Constantinople" and Negroponte to cite Isnard and his vicar Gregory of Pavia, also a Dominican, to appear within six months at the Curia Romana in Avignon to face the charges of having disregarded John XXII's excommunication of the Catalan *invasores, occupatores et detentores* of the Athenian duchy, in whose presence Isnard had deliberately celebrated mass, and on whose behalf he had falsely published a declaration that the papacy had relaxed the ban of excommunication which had fallen upon them.⁸³ By this time, however, it must have been clear to everyone that Gautier had no chance of regaining the duchy. And yet history was not yet done with him, for in 1342–1343 he enhanced his fame or notoriety as tyrant of Florence. He fought at Crécy in August, 1346, and a decade later (in September, 1356) he died, the last of his line, as a constable of France at Poitiers.

Don Alfonso Fadrique had been removed from the vicariate-general before the Brienne expedition of 1331–1332. The Venetians may possibly have demanded his replacement as the chief condition of their neutrality; whatever the reason, his successors were less aggressive, and the Catalans acquired no further territory in Greece. But for some time the Venetians in Negroponte and the Aegean islands had had increasing cause to fear attacks from the Turks of the Anatolian emirates.⁸⁴ The Venetians

⁷⁷ Mollat, *Jean XXII: Lettres communes*, XIII (Paris, 1933), no. 63752, p. 182; printed in full in Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 34, pp. 55–60, and in Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, doc. CLVIII, pp. 206–9, but incorrectly dated 1333 in both Lampros and Rubió.

⁷⁸ Du Cange-Buchon, II (1826), pp. 204–5; Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85, p. 436 (repr., I, 370); and on their names, see Rubió, *Dipl.*, p. 208, note.

⁷⁹ Hopf, *op. cit.*, vol. 85, pp. 433, 436 (repr., I, 367, 370); *Dipl.*, docs. CLXII–CLXIII, pp. 212–14, and *cf.* doc. CLXV, pp. 214–15.

⁸⁰ *Cf.* *Dipl.*, docs. CLXV, CLXVII, pp. 214–15, 216, dated 11 March, 1336, and 15 March, 1337.

⁸¹ *Dipl.*, docs. I, CXXXV, pp. 63, 166–67; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus septimus, no. 8255, pp. 158–59; Du Cange-Buchon, II (1826), 196. Isnard Tacconi had been the archbishop of Thebes years before (1308–1311), at the time of the battle of Halmyros; thereafter he became bishop of Pavia (1311–1319), but being accused of "various crimes" by certain clerics in his diocese, he had lost both the patriarchal and episcopal dignities on 30 July, 1319. Later on, he was vindicated or at least restored to papal favor; on 25 July, 1325, he was made an apostolic penitentiary; and on 29 May, 1326, he was restored to the archiepiscopal see of Thebes (Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I [1913, repr. 1960], 93, 389, 482)—an adventurous career even for a Latin ecclesiastic in the Levant.

⁸² *Dipl.*, doc. CLXVII, p. 216; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 37, pp. 67–68; J.-M. Vidal, ed., *Benoît XII: Lettres communes*, I (Paris, 1903), no. 5214, p. 493. Gautier had read an intercepted letter from Archbishop Isnard to King Frederick of Sicily.

⁸³ Vidal, *Benoît XII: Lettres communes*, II (Paris, 1906), no. 7420, pp. 206–7, dated 16 March, 1339; *Dipl.*, doc. CLXVIII, pp. 217–20, misdated 1338; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 35, pp. 60–66; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 66, 70, pp. 43–44.

⁸⁴ *Cf.* Marino Sanudo, *Ep.* XXI, in Jacques Bongars, *Gesta Dei*, II (1611), 314, also in Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, doc. CXLIV, pp. 175–76, dated 15 February, 1329. Archbishop Isnard Tacconi of Thebes, a man says Sanudo of *sapientia et probitas*, had been active in Venice in 1329, attempting on papal instructions to secure large-scale assistance against the Turks (note Sanudo, *Ep.* xx, in Bongars, II, 313), who

seem to have thought that, without Don Alfonso, the Catalan Company might help them to protect their coasts against Turkish attack. On 4 March, 1339, the Senate voted to inform the bailie of Negroponte "that if the Catalans are willing to contribute a sum of money toward the formation of an armada, the bailie should have the money paid to himself according to arrangements he can make with them, and thereafter the said armada should be formed in such fashion as shall seem best to the bailie and his council."⁸⁵ There is no evidence, however, that the Catalans contributed to the "armada," which was presumably intended as a shore patrol.

After Don Alfonso's death (about 1338), Catalan relations with the Venetian colony in Negroponte appear gradually to have improved. The leaders of the Company doubtless believed that continued Venetian neutrality would help offset Gautier de Brienne's influence at the French courts of Avignon and Naples. Thus, a Venetian document of 6 July, 1346, informs us of a loan of 9,000 hyperperi made to Marco Soranzo, the Venetian bailie of Negroponte, by Berenguer de Puigverde, *miles et civis Athenarum*.⁸⁶ The loan was to help Soranzo bear "the burden of expenses with which the Republic is heavy laden." Puigverde had signed the Catalan-Venetian truce of 1321. The Venetians still had occasion, however, from time to time, to complain of Catalan violence and piracy, for in March, 1350, the Signoria was distressed by an attack upon Venetian subjects in Pteleum by "members of the Company and Albanians," and held up to opprobrium the piratical conduct of Don Alfonso's eldest son Pedro [I] Fadrique.⁸⁷ Don Pedro had succeeded his father as lord of Salona, Loidoriki, Veteranitza, Aegina, and possibly Zeitounion, but some time between 1350 and 1355 the Crown "revoked" his fiefs for

reasons, wrote Frederick III in December of the latter year, "which we believe are not unknown to you." The extant documents, however, do not provide the reasons for the forfeiture. After Pedro's death (before 1355), his brother James got back the fiefs, which their father had wished him to receive in the event of Pedro's demise without heirs.⁸⁸

A third brother, John, was lord of Aegina and Salamis in April, 1350, when Pope Clement VI granted a dispensation for his marriage to Marulla Zaccaria, daughter of Guglielma Pallavicini, the "lady of Thermopylae," by her first husband Bartolommeo Zaccaria. Although Marulla and John Fadrique were related within the prohibited third degree of consanguinity, Clement granted the dispensation, because John's strong right arm was needed to protect Guglielma's margraviate of Boudonitza against incursions of the Turks and Albanians.⁸⁹ A fourth brother, Boniface, inherited from his mother, Marulla of Verona, the castle town of Carystus in Negroponte and certain other properties in Attica which in 1359, after long residence in Sicily, he returned to Greece to claim.⁹⁰ From documents relating to James and Boniface Fadrique a fair part of the history of the Athenian duchy must be written until the last decade or so of Catalan dominion in continental Greece.

Although Berenguer de Puigverde could lend money in 1346 to the bailie of Negroponte, the Catalan Company could do little to assist the Venetians or to respond to papal exhortations against the Turks of the Anatolian emirates. In view of her economic resources, Venice was not so heavily laden as even the Company's homeland of Aragon-Catalonia. The Catalan empire was probably at its height, but the wars of King Pedro IV, who later became duke of Athens and Neopatras (in 1380), were to exhaust the capacities of his energetic countrymen. The Catalans could press their ambitions against the hostile Genoese and the Moors of North Africa only if

were raiding in the Archipelago, and had attacked the island of Euboea three times and the duchy of Athens once: to death and destruction the Turks added the capture of young men, whom they sold into slavery in Asia Minor (Sanudo, *Ep.* xxiii, in Bongars, II, 315-16; *Dipl.*, doc. cxlix, p. 189, dated 28 October, 1329). On Isnard Tacconi, see Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, esp. nos. 23, 26, 28-29, 32-37, 42, pp. 35-39.

⁸⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. clxxiii, pp. 225-26, where by an error of transcription *quem* is given for *qui* [*baiulo et consilio videbitur*], and cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85 (1867), 438b (repr. 1960, I, 372b).

⁸⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. cxc, pp. 247-48.

⁸⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. cxcv, p. 253.

⁸⁸ Cf. *Dipl.*, doc. ccxxiii, pp. 298-99; Rosario Gregorio, *Opere rare* (1873), p. 360; *Dipl.*, doc. cclxxii, pp. 356-57, relating to the possession of Salona, Loidoriki, and Veteranitza by James, the second son of Don Alfonso.

⁸⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. cx cvi, p. 254, and cf. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 478, 502, and Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 115, pp. 53-54.

⁹⁰ Cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination* (1975), pp. 50-51. In 1365 Boniface Fadrique sold Carystus to Venice for 6,000 ducats, on which see above, note 67.

their sea power was equal to the large demands which the unsettled conditions of the time imposed upon them. Catalan interests in Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily, and the Greek duchies could be protected only by sufficient numbers of galleys and transports and by the recruitment of adequate crews and fighting forces. Actually the Catalans were overextended in the eastern Mediterranean, and the means and manpower of the Crown of Aragon were strained to supply the naval armament necessary to deal with such western opponents as the Moors and the Genoese.⁹¹ In seeking to deal with the enmity of the latter, Don Pedro IV naturally looked toward Venice, and in 1351 even the Catalans in the Athenian duchy became peripherally involved in the resumption of the long-continued commercial war between Venice and Genoa (1350–1355). On 1 June, 1351, Don Pedro reminded his countrymen “in Romania” of the strong ties of innate loyalty, of which they were well aware, that bound them to the lands of their origin.⁹² We cannot here be concerned with this war, so important in the history of Byzantium; peace was made on 1 June, 1355, but the war was resumed years later over possession of Tenedos and concluded with the peace of Turin in August, 1381, after the final success of the Venetians at Chioggia.⁹³

⁹¹ Cf. J. A. Robson, “The Catalan Fleet and Moorish Sea-power (1337–1344),” *English Historical Review*, LXXIV (1959), 386–408. On the relations of the Catalans of both Aragon-Catalonia and Sicily (in terms of warfare, missionary activity, treaties of peace, and commerce) with the Hafšids of Tunis, see C.-E. Dufourcq, “Les Activités politiques et économiques des Catalans en Tunisie et en Algérie orientale de 1262 à 1377,” *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, XIX (1946), 5–95. Dufourcq has dealt more extensively with the “orientation thalassocratique” of the Catalans and their movement toward North Africa in *L’Espagne catalane et le Maghrib aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, Paris, 1966, which however covers the thirteenth century much more fully than the fourteenth.

⁹² *Dipl.*, doc. CXCIX, pp. 257–58. On the Catalan involvement in the war between Venice and Genoa, see Anthony Luttrell, “John Cantacuzenus and the Catalans at Constantinople (1352–1354),” in Martínez Ferrando, *Archivero: Miscelánea de estudios dedicados a su memoria*, Barcelona, 1968, pp. 265–77, and cf. C. P. Kyrris, “John Cantacuzenus, the Genoese, the Venetians and the Catalans (1348–1354),” *Byzantina*, IV (1972), 333–56.

⁹³ H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920, repr. Aalen, 1964), 207–15, with the sources for the “third Genoese war” (1350–1355), *ibid.*, pp. 604–5, and for the “war of Chioggia” and the sources, see pp. 229–42, 608–11. On the dispute over Tenedos and the peace of Turin, see above, Chapter 13, pp. 321–26.

For decades the Avignonese Curia regarded the Catalans in Greece as without the Christian pale, although in February, 1341, Pope Benedict XII wrote Henry d’Asti, Latin patriarch of Constantinople and bishop of Negroponte, that he would receive the procurators whom the Company wished to send to the Curia to treat of the Catalans’ return “to the bosom of Mother Church.”⁹⁴ In 1342 the difficult but probably pro-Catalan Isnard Tacconi died; the Carmelite friar Philip, formerly bishop of Salona (1332–1342), replaced him as archbishop of Thebes;⁹⁵ but by then the pacific Benedict XII was also dead, and Catalan hopes of reconciliation had died with him. Benedict had tried to organize a league of the great powers against the Turks, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, and his successor Clement VI pushed forward plans for a crusade. The Latin patriarch Henry d’Asti was appointed papal legate in the East on 31 August, 1343,⁹⁶ and on 21 October Clement directed him to try to bring about “peace and concord” between Gautier de Brienne and the Catalan Grand Company in order to help pave the way toward an offensive against the Turks.⁹⁷ After Henry d’Asti’s death at Smyrna in the Turkish attack of 17 January, 1345, Clement instructed Raymond Saquet, the bishop of Théroutanne, whom he had designated as the new legate in the East, to continue the efforts to make peace between Gautier and the Company, for it was important to the prosecution of war against the Turks.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Georges Daumet, ed., *Benoît XII: Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, fasc. 2 (1902), no. 810, cols. 515–16; *Dipl.*, doc. CLXXVII, pp. 228–29.

⁹⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. CLXXIX, pp. 230–31, dated 26 August, 1342; in 1351 Philip was transferred from the Theban archdiocese to Conza in southern Italy, and Sirello di Pietro d’Ancona succeeded him (*ibid.*, doc. CXCVIII, p. 256). Hopf, *op. cit.*, vol. 85, p. 439a, erroneously states that Isnard’s successor in Thebes was the archdeacon Leonardo Pisani (on whom cf. *Dipl.*, doc. CLX, pp. 210–11). Cf. Eubel, I, 203, 482. The canons of the Theban chapter had elected Pisani as archbishop, but Clement VI set their action aside (Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 75–76, 79, 82, pp. 45–46, 47).

⁹⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. CLXXXI, pp. 232–34; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. I, doc. 39, pp. 70–74; Eugène Déprez, ed., *Clément VI: Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 1 (1901), no. 388, cols. 162–63.

⁹⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CLXXXII, pp. 234–35; Déprez, I, fasc. 1, no. 465, cols. 204–5.

⁹⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. CLXXXIII, pp. 236–37, properly dated 1 April, 1345, as in Déprez, I, fasc. 2 (1925), no. 1608, cols. 482–84. Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, p. 237, note 1, questions the date of the Patriarch Henry’s death only because he has

There was obviously a widespread belief that the Catalan Company could be useful in the crusade, and on 15 June, 1346, at the behest of the Dauphin Humbert II of Viennois, who was then in the East on the second Smyrniote Crusade, Clement VI declared himself ready to remove, without prejudice to the rights of Gautier de Brienne, the bans of excommunication and the interdict laid long before upon the Catalans and their lands, provided the Company furnished a hundred horse to serve for three years with Humbert's crusading army.⁹⁹ But, as we know, the Catalan Company did not take part in the crusade, and so (after a brief suspension perhaps) the bans were automatically renewed. In 1354–1355, however, when King Pedro IV of Aragon was trying to get possession of the coveted head of S. George, patron of Catalonia, which relic was kept in the castle of Livadia,¹⁰⁰ he promised the Company that he would do his best to have the interdict lifted which the Holy Father in Avignon had laid upon them at the instance of Gautier de Brienne.¹⁰¹ On 16 September, 1356, Don Pedro wrote Cardinal Pierre de Cros, asking him to seek the removal of the interdict "for the confusion of the infidel Turks and of the schismatic Greeks, enemies of the Roman Catholic faith,"¹⁰² and on 3 December, 1358, Pope Innocent VI suspended, for a year, the bans of excommunication and interdict;¹⁰³ but they were renewed "just as before," and on 25 December, 1363, removed again, for three years, by Pope Urban V.¹⁰⁴ If their Father in

heaven was as implacable as their Father in Avignon, the Catalans might well despair of the kingdom of heaven.

There was an uprising in the capital city of Thebes in April or May, 1362, against the tyrannical vicar-general Pedro de Pou, who was killed along with his wife Angelina, Michael Oller, dean of the Theban minster, and a half-dozen of his most prominent supporters.¹⁰⁵ The strong and stubborn Roger de Lluria, who had been marshal of the Company for almost ten years (from before December, 1354), led the opposition to de Pou, and took over the functions and clearly used the title of vicar-general from 1362 to 1366 when Frederick III of Sicily was finally forced to legalize his usurpation.¹⁰⁶ We have no knowledge of what went on in Athens during that eventful spring of 1362, but the Theban debacle doubtless created excitement at the royal court in Sicily.

The sources suggest that Pedro de Pou had been a poor governor, unjust and avaricious, but he had apparently been able to count on the dean of Thebes, Michael Oller, who had died intestate. Like others in his time, Oller had apparently found the ecclesiastical life consistent with the accumulation of wealth, for besides other property he is said to have left cash assets amounting to some 5,000 or 6,000

misdated the document. There are more than twenty such errors in dates in Rubió's collection of documents, for which see Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, 194, where however Rubió's doc. CLXXXIII is not listed, but cf. Loenertz, *ibid.*, XXVIII, no. 92, p. 48.

⁹⁹ Déprez, II, fasc. 3 (1958), no. 2580, pp. 180–83, esp. p. 182b, and no. 2590, p. 184b; *Dipl.*, docs. CLXXXVIII–CLXXXIX, pp. 242–47.

¹⁰⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXIV, p. 293, dated 1 December, 1354, and note docs. CCXV–CCXX.

¹⁰¹ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXI, p. 297, dated 17 March, 1355, and see K. M. Setton, "Saint George's Head," *Speculum*, XLVIII (1973), 1–12.

¹⁰² *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXX, p. 304. Cardinal Pierre de Cros was Clement VI's nephew (Eubel, I, 19).

¹⁰³ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXXV, pp. 309–10.

¹⁰⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLV, pp. 338–39. The disaster of Halmyros in 1311 was never forgotten at the French-dominated Curia, where the Athenian duchy was regarded as the possession *de jure* of the Brienne and their heirs, "ducatus Athenarum detentus a gentibus que dicuntur Magna Societas pro interfectione Gualterii ducis . . .," but the bans were periodically lifted from the Grand Company for a good reason: ". . . quasi totus populus partium illarum

que iuxta infideles et scismaticos existebant, prout existunt, derelicta fide catholica ad scismaticorum ritus transiverant et idem de reliquis timebatur et verisimilis spes haberetur quod ipsi si erga se apostolice sedis benignitatem sentirent ad Romane ecclesie obedientiam et unitatem redirent . . ." (*doc. cit.*).

¹⁰⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXC, pp. 377–79; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. IV, doc. 20, pp. 256–59. For the death of Pedro de Pou's wife Angelina, note *Dipl.*, p. 378, and for that of Michael Oller, *loc. cit.*, and doc. CCLII, p. 335, and cf. in general Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, no. 61, p. 116. Oller was canon and dean of Thebes, and held a canonry in the Church of Neopatra (Dipl., docs. CCXVII, CCXIX, pp. 295, 296). He seems to have been a native of Majorca.

¹⁰⁶ A Venetian document of July, 1365, refers to Roger de Lluria both as *vicarius Thebarum* and as marshal and *vicarius generalis universitatis ducatus Athenarum* (*Dipl.*, doc. CCLVIII, p. 341), and Venetian documents of August, 1365, and July, 1369—both relating to Roger's seizure of money or property from a Venetian citizen in August, 1362, on which see below—identify Roger as *vicarius universitatis Athenarum* (*Dipl.*, docs. CCLX, CCCXIII, pp. 344, 400). The titles are peculiar. On 3 August, 1366, however, Frederick III addressed Roger officially as *ducatum Athenarum et Neopatrie vicarius generalis* (*Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXI, p. 355; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. IV, no. 89, p. 335), which shows that his appointment must have preceded this date. Roger was still vicar-general in November, 1368 (*Dipl.*, doc. CCCXI, p. 397). He died late in 1369 or early in 1370.

gold *regales* Majorcan.¹⁰⁷ While Oller's accounts no longer exist for audit, we may well wonder how much of his cash and *alia bona* had been lifted from the estate of the late Sirello di Pietro d'Ancona, archbishop of Thebes.

Pope Urban V was wondering the same thing when on 3 November, 1363, he wrote the Franciscan friar Thomas, archbishop of Paros and Naxos, that his predecessor Innocent VI had learned that all the movable goods, property, and income of the late Sirello d'Ancona were properly reserved for the Holy See. Nevertheless, the recently deceased Michael Oller and his accomplices had illegally seized Sirello's possessions and taken over his income. Innocent VI had therefore instructed Thomas of Paros, Archbishop Nicholas of Athens, and Bishop Nicholas of Andros to conduct a full investigation of Sirello's assets, which Thomas tried to do, but reported back to the Curia Romana in Avignon that he had encountered an obstacle. When in obedience to the papal mandate he had claimed Oller's estate for the apostolic treasury, one Grifon of Arezzo, a canon of Coron, had intervened. Grifon represented himself as the vicar-general of Pierre Thomas, now archbishop of Crete and at the time bishop of Coron. Pierre Thomas had been for some time the apostolic legate *in partibus ultramarinis* (he later increased his fame by the part he played in the Alexandria crusade of 1365). Grifon stated that Oller's movable goods had been especially reserved by papal letters for Pierre Thomas, and he so warned the archbishops of Paros and Athens in the course of their investigation as well as Archbishop Paulus of Thebes. Grifon in fact informed them all that they faced the prospect of excommunication if they acted contrary to the special commission which he held of the legate Pierre. Under these circumstances, Thomas of Paros wrote the pope, he had desisted from execution of the papal mandate until he could receive further instructions from Avignon. At this point Pope Urban could consult the legate Pierre Thomas himself about Grifon's assertions, for Pierre was in Avignon, having just returned from the East. The legate was unaware of any papal concession of Oller's estate (and the possessions of the erstwhile Sirello), and denied ever having authorized Grifon to

claim it for him. The pope therefore directed the archbishop of Paros to take over and restore to the Holy See the properties and revenues left by Sirello (which were chiefly at issue), notwithstanding the alleged mandate of Grifon or of any other claimant of whatsoever rank or condition who might appear on the scene. Thomas of Paros was, if necessary, to have recourse to the secular arm, and whoever might seek to impede him exposed himself to excommunication.¹⁰⁸

In August, 1362, the Marshal Roger de Lluria had seized from a Venetian citizen money or valuables amounting to more than 500 hyperperi,¹⁰⁹ and for this or some other reason the Catalans in the Athenian duchy were soon caught up in an armed conflict with the Venetians of Negroponte, which lasted until

¹⁰⁸ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 246, fols. 45^v–46^v, "datum Avinione III non. Novembris anno primo," i.e. 3 November, 1363—although elected on 28 September, 1362, Urban V was not crowned until the following 6 November (cf. G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, 9th ed., Paris, 1949, pp. 109–10): in dating papal documents the coronation day (not the date of election) was the first day of the first regnal year. On Pierre Thomas's activities in 1362–1363, see F. J. Boehlke, Jr., *Pierre de Thomas: Scholar, Diplomat, and Crusader*, Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 204 ff. Pierre Thomas was bishop of Coron from 10 May, 1359, until his successor was elected on 17 February, 1363; he held the archiepiscopal see of Crete from 6 March, 1363, until his appointment to the Latin patriarchal title of Constantinople on 5 July, 1364; he helped lead, as noted above, the Alexandria crusade of 1365, and died on 6 January, 1366. Cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 212, 215, 206. Sirello di Pietro (Sirellus Petri), whose possessions were at stake, was a native of Ancona and a sometime canon of Patras; he was archbishop of Thebes from 20 May, 1351, until his death before 15 May, 1357, when the well-known Paulus of Smyrna was selected as his successor (Eubel, I, 482, and *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXXII, p. 305). Paulus was long prominent in eastern affairs; he succeeded Pierre Thomas as Latin patriarch of Constantinople (Eubel, I, 206, and cf. *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXIV, p. 347). Archbishop Thomas of Paros and Naxos was a Franciscan; he held the island sees from 30 June, 1357, but the date of his death appears still to be unknown (Eubel, I, 358). Nicholas de Raynaldo was appointed archbishop of Athens on 19 June, 1357 (Eubel, I, 115, and *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXXIII, pp. 306–7), and died before 6 June, 1365 (Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 137, 139–40, 142, 152, 159). Nicholas of Andros was an Augustinian; appointed bishop on 14 July, 1349, he died before 16 June, 1376 (Eubel, I, 89, and Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 112, 190). For the Sirello affair, which illustrates the fiscal vigilance of the apostolic treasury, and for the *dramatis personae* involved, I have drawn both the text and this note from Setton, in *A History of the Crusades*, III (1975), 200–201.

¹⁰⁹ *Dipl.*, docs. CCLX, CCCXIII, pp. 344, 400, dated 28 August, 1365, and 5 July, 1369, recalling that in 1362 one Nicoletto Bassadon suffered "quoddam damnum . . . ad summam yperperorum quingentorum viginti duorum."

¹⁰⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLII, p. 335, dated at Barcelona 26 August, 1362: King Pedro IV of Aragon claimed Oller's estate for the latter's next of kin.

1365. There was discord in the Catalan duchies; lacking a legal basis for his exercise of authority, Roger turned to the Turks for help, as Don Alfonso had done more than forty years before; and early in 1363 Turks were in fact admitted within the walls of Thebes. Paulus, archbishop of Thebes (1357–1366) and later the Latin patriarch,¹¹⁰ and three other persons of importance appeared before Frederick III in Sicily, allegedly as “envoys or ambassadors sent by certain municipalities . . . of the aforesaid duchies.” In the mid-summer of 1363 they told the royal court about the Turkish soldiery in Thebes, and Frederick now reappointed a former vicar-general, Matteo de Moncada, to official command in the duchies. Moncada was to free the royal duke’s faithful subjects from the infidel encampment in their midst. He was also to proclaim an amnesty; take charge of the castles on the royal domain; appoint officials, and receive their oaths of fealty in the king’s name; and collect the crown revenues for the support of his retinue and the maintenance of the royal castles.¹¹¹ Although Moncada did not himself venture into Greece, he did send an armed company, which unwisely tried to arrest certain followers of the rebellious Marshal Roger de Lluria, whose troopers, possibly including the Turkish mercenaries, made short work of Moncada’s force.¹¹² Roger’s chief ally through these months was his brother John, and the Avignonese Curia was shocked by their employment of Turks to maintain their position.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Cf. *Dipl.*, docs. CCXXXII, CCLXIV, pp. 305, 347.

¹¹¹ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLIII, pp. 336–37, dated 16 August, 1363: Lluria’s contingent of Turks was said to be a menace to both town and countryside: “. . . fideles nostri tam cives quam agricolae alique ad civitatis ipsius [sic] per tramites discurrentes tam mares quam feminae diversa gravia et abominanda flagitia patiantur . . .” (*Dipl.*, p. 336). Archbishop Paulus of Thebes had apparently fled from Roger de Lluria. While he was in Sicily, Paulus served Frederick III as an envoy to Naples in an effort to make peace between Frederick and Joanna I. On these negotiations, see K. M. Setton, “Archbishop Pierre d’Amiel in Naples and the Affair of Aimon III of Geneva (1363–1364),” *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 643–91, and cf. *Hist. Crusades*, III, 201–2.

¹¹² *Dipl.*, doc. CCXC, p. 378, dated 18 May, 1367, a general amnesty granted by Frederick III to the victorious Roger de Lluria and his partisans for all the excesses they had committed during and after the Theban uprising of five years before; Lampros, *Eggrapha*, pt. IV, no. 20, p. 257; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, no. 67, p. 117.

¹¹³ Cf. Urban V’s letter of 27 June, 1364, to Roger and John de Lluria in Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 246, fol. 241r: “. . . quod vos contagiosa familiaritate a participatione infidelium Turchorum, vestras famam et animas

As far as public opinion was concerned, it was a poor time to have Turkish confederates. The year before (in March, 1363), John II of France and Peter I of Cyprus had taken the cross in a solemn ceremony at Avignon, as we have seen, and the Curia was full of talk about a coming crusade. Pacific by nature, a Benedictine monk, ascetic and learned, Urban V was withal bent upon prosecution of the crusade. He was scandalized by the fact “that in the city of Thebes and other places roundabout a profane multitude of infidel Turks are dwelling,” as he wrote the archbishop of Patras on 27 June, 1364, “and constantly striving to attack the lands of your Church of Patras and other nearby areas belonging to the faithful.” Urban charged the archbishop

that fired with the love of God and with fervor for His faith you should rise up against these Turks, manfully and as powerfully as your strength allows, so that with God’s right hand providing you and his other servants with valor the said Turks may be repulsed . . . , and you stepping forth as a true boxer of Christ may gain more fully thereby the reward of eternal recompense and the plenitude of our grace.¹¹⁴

maculantes, ipsos in terris vestris receptatis eisque datis auxilium et favorem . . .” (also in *Dipl.*, doc. CCLVI, p. 339, where by a slip the text reads “receptis,” which is untranslatable, for “receptatis”).

¹¹⁴ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 246, fol. 240, letter dated at Avignon on 27 June, 1364: “Venerabili fratri archiepiscopo Patracensi salutem, . . . Cum . . . nuper audiverimus fide digna relatione quamplurimum non sine amaritudine cordis nostri quod in civitate Thebana et aliis circumvicinis partibus infidelium Turchorum prophana multitudo moretur ac terras ecclesie tue Patracensis et alias circumstantes partes fidelium impugnare assidue molitur, fraternitatem tuam rogamus et hortamur attente tibi nichilominus iniungentes quatenus zelo dei eiusque fidei fervore succensus adversus ipsos Turchos sic exurgas viriliter et pro tua facultate potenter quod dei dextera tecum et cum aliis suis famulis faciente virtutem dicti Turchi per tuam et aliorum partium illarum fidelium quibus similiter scribimus de dictis partibus repellantur tuque verus pugil Christi existens exinde premium retributionis eterne et gratie nostre plenitudinem uberius consequaris. Datum Avinione V Kal. Julii anno secundo.” Much the same letter was addressed on the same day to the whole hierarchy and clergy, the bailie, baronage, and towns of the Achaean principality (*ibid.*, Reg. Vat. 246, fol. 240v). The texts of these documents are not given in Paul Lecacheux, ed., *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Urbain V (1362–1370) se rapportant à la France*, I, fasc. 2 (Paris, 1906), nos. 1047–49, p. 163, nor do they appear in Rubió i Lluch’s *Diplomatari*. In a bull, directed *ad perpetuam rei memoriam* and dated 21 March, 1364, Urban V excommunicated among various other classes of malefactors those who supplied horses, arms, iron, timber, and *alia prohibita* to the Moslems, who carried on war against the Christians (Reg.

On the same day Urban addressed a letter of grim remonstrance to the brothers Roger and John de Lluria, *vestras famam et animas maculantes*, ordering them to dismiss their Turkish mercenaries and take up arms against them, restore to the Theban Church the goods and properties they had seized, and readmit the Archbishop Paulus, who had had to abandon his see.¹¹⁵

The Angevin bailie of the principality of Achaea and Manuel Cantacuzenus, the despot of Mistra, together with the Venetians and the Hospitallers, employed their resources in common to combat the Turkish peril. The Turks were defeated in a naval battle off Megara, southern fortress of the Catalan duchy of Athens; they lost thirty-five ships, and looked to the walls of Thebes for safety and to the assistance of Roger de Lluria. But in the long run the defeated Turks would be a poor ally, and the indignant pope, the inimical Angevin, and the sage Venetian the wrong enemies. Lluria sought peace with the Venetians in Negroponte, and on 25 July, 1365, the Senate, with some reservations, sanctioned the cessation of hostilities, and so informed their bailie in Negroponte.¹¹⁶ When the Turks

had departed from Thebes, and peace had been restored with the Venetians, close relations were finally re-established between the rebellious Catalans in the Athenian duchy, led by the Marshal de Lluria, and their king and duke in distant Sicily.

When the uncertainties of rebellion and war appeared to have passed, the free inhabitants of the duchies met in their town councils to provide for the future. Thereafter, during the last days of December, 1366, a general assembly was convened at Thebes, where a petition was prepared for submission to King Frederick III of Sicily. On 2 January, 1367, the chancellor of the Grand Company affixed the seal of S. George to the document, which Rubió i Lluch has called the "Articles of Thebes," and at Messina on 18 May the king answered the requests of his subjects overseas one by one as the text was read to him. Frederick insisted upon retaining the final right of appointment to the important castles of Livadia, Neopatras, and Siderocastron, but he agreed to the continuance of the Marshal Roger de Lluria as vicar-general, to which of course he had no alternative. He also agreed to an amnesty for Roger and his partisans and to the expropriation, more or less, of properties of the late Pedro de Pou in favor of the marshal as compensation for the expenses he had undergone and the losses he had suffered.¹¹⁷ Roger had won, but within less than three years death was to remove him from the scene.

The Articles of Thebes helped to secure some years of most uneasy peace in the duchies, although of course the Catalans had external enemies. In 1370–1371 the nephews of Gautier II de Brienne (his sister Isabelle's sons)—Count John d'Enghien of Lecce, Count Louis of Conversano, and Guy, lord of Argos and Nauplia—embarked upon a campaign

Vat. 246, fol. 141^v, "datum et actum Avinione XII Kal. Aprilis anno secundo").

¹¹⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLVI, pp. 339–40, and cf. Lecacheux, *Lettres secrètes et curiales*, I, fasc. 2, no. 1050, p. 163.

¹¹⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLVIII, pp. 340–41, and cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* (1975), pp. 60–61. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, nos. 68, 73, pp. 118, 119, is doubtless correct in assuming that Lluria's Turks were not an Ottoman contingent, sent to his aid by the emir Murad I, but mercenaries secured from one of the emirates of Asia Minor. The Turkish defeat off Megara, usually put in the summer of 1364, should conceivably be dated about 1359–1360, and may explain how Lluria came to hire Turks in the first place, but the chronology is uncertain (cf. Loenertz, *op. cit.*, pp. 430–31). According to the *Aragonese Chronicle of the Morea* (*Libro de los fechos*, ed. Morel-Fatio, Geneva, 1885, par. 685, p. 151), when Gautier de Lor was bailie of the Angevin principality (1357–1360), he burned thirty-five Turkish ships after an encounter at Megara, his allies in the undertaking being the Despot Manuel Cantacuzenus, the Venetians, and the Hospitallers, "and the Turks fled to Thebes, to Roger de Lluria, who was at that time vicar and governor of the duchy." De Lluria, however, was never vicar-general of the duchy while Gautier de Lor was bailie of Achaea. The imperial historian John Cantacuzenus, IV, 13 (Bonn, III, 90, lines 3–7), alludes to the same event and also identifies Roger de Lluria by name (cf. D. M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos* [Cantacuzenus], ca. 1100–1460, Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 125). In any event we have seen that the papal correspondence makes it perfectly clear that there were Turks in Thebes early in 1364.

¹¹⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLXXXIX, pp. 374–77. The castles of Livadia and Neopatras might remain at the king's good pleasure "in dictarum universitatum custodia," which meant that the town councils could provide and control the garrisons, but the king refused to delete the saving phrase *ad beneplacitum regie maiestatis* in his grant of the custody since it would derogate from the royal dignity, and emergencies might some time require him to appoint castellans whom he could trust to take charge of the castles. For further details concerning the petition, see Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, nos. 93, 98, pp. 125, 126, and for the use of the *sigillum seu bulla beati Georgii*, see above, p. 445b.

against the Catalans.¹¹⁸ But they failed to win Venetian support to help wrest the Athenian duchy from that "nefarious Company of Catalans who seized and still retain the aforesaid duchy against God and justice."¹¹⁹ The Briennist heirs were thus forced to accept a truce with the Catalans in August, 1371, and even a proposed marriage alliance between the Enghien and the Llurias came to nothing.¹²⁰ The Catalans in Athens, in the meantime, who had observed with dismay the inept rule of King Frederick III in Sicily, the persistence of the Enghien, and the ever-growing menace of the Turks, had "on many and diverse occasions" asked Queen Eleanor of Aragon, wife of King Pedro IV and sister of Frederick III, "that she might be willing to receive them as vassals," and in June, 1370, her Majesty informed her royal brother of Sicily that she was prepared to take over the Catalan duchies in Greece and would make therefor considerations totaling some 100,000 florins.¹²¹ These negotiations came to nothing, and the Catalans in Athens and Neopatras had to wait another decade before they found themselves directly under the "sacrosanct Crown of Aragon."

Frederick III's status among the sovereigns of Europe seemed to be enhanced in 1372 when Queen Joanna I of Naples finally abandoned the Angevin claim to the Sicilian kingdom, and Pope Gregory XI accepted the Sicilian branch of the house of Barcelona back into the fold of the Church.¹²² At that time

Gregory was much disturbed, like his uncle Clement VI a generation before, by the danger which threatened the Latin states in Greece, because vast numbers of Turks were carrying their attacks "to the confines of the kingdom of Serbia, Albania, the principality of Achaea, and the duchy of Athens." On 13 November, 1372, at the tearful behest of Archbishop Francis of Neopatras (1369?-1376), Gregory called for a congress of most of the Christian princes of eastern Europe and the Levant as well as the doges of Venice and Genoa to meet in Thebes, which was "considered to be more convenient than any other place." The congress was to meet on the following 1 October (1373), and each ruler was to send delegates with full authority "to negotiate and form a union of prelates, princes, and magnates who shall agree to be bound in this union [against the Turks] and to contribute thereto, and to offer and promise the guaranteed assistance of an armed force to be maintained on land and sea." His Holiness warned of the dangers in delay and of the difficulties inherent in distance, and urged every recipient of his summons to begin gathering troops for action against the Turks without waiting for the delegates to assemble at the congress.¹²³ The results of the papal exhortation are uncertain, but apparently the congress was never held.¹²⁴ No union of Latin states was possible at this time, and even if it had been, the Catalans were in no position to assist a Christian alliance. Toward the end of 1374

¹¹⁸ A Venetian document of 21 March, 1396 (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 43, fol. 119^r), seems to refer to Guy d'Enghien's "war" with the Catalan duchy twenty-five years before (*tempore domini Guidonis de Engino et eo habente guerram cum ducatu Athenarum* . . .). On the futile effort of the brothers d'Enghien to recover the Athenian duchy, see A. Luttrell, "Latins of Argos and Nauplia," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XXXIV (1966), 41-42. The Enghien of course claimed only the duchy of Athens, not that of Neopatras (as Luttrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 46, says inadvertently), which the Catalans had wrested from the Greeks in 1319.

¹¹⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXX, pp. 407-8, dated 22 April, 1370, and doc. CCCXVII, pp. 403-5, dated 9 February, 1371 (misdated 8 February, 1370, in *Dipl.* and Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, nos. 111-12, p. 130). The latter document appears in the Misti, Reg. 33, fol. 91, where it is dated "MCCCLXX ind. VIII die nono Februarii," which *more veneto* means 1371. Cf. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 172, p. 65, where the year is corrected to 1371, but the day is still wrong.

¹²⁰ *Dipl.*, docs. CCCXXXI-CCCXXXII, pp. 418-19.

¹²¹ *Dipl.*, docs. CCCXXXIII-CCCXXXIV, pp. 411-15, esp. p. 414.

¹²² Étienne Baluze and Guillaume Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I (Paris, 1914), 421, and cf. Fran-

cesco de Stefano, "La Soluzione della questione siciliana (1372)," *Archivio storico per la Sicilia orientale*, XXIX (2nd ser., IX, 1933), 48-76.

¹²³ Augustin Theiner, ed., *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, 2 vols., Rome, 1859-60, II, doc. CCLXII, p. 130, letter dated 13 November, 1372, to King Louis of Hungary; J. A. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II (1845): Florence, doc. xxxix, pp. 218-20, to Nerio Acciajuoli, "lord of the city of Corinth;" Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari*, docs. CCCXXXVI-CCCXXXVII, pp. 423-26, to the Byzantine Emperor John V Palaeologus and (from Theiner, *loc. cit.*) to Louis of Hungary; and cf. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 176, p. 66. Archbishop Francis of Neopatras was a Franciscan, but little is known about him (Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 362).

¹²⁴ O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, Warsaw, 1930, repr. London, 1972, pp. 254-63, contrary to the usual account as given in Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. 86 (1868; repr., 1960, II), 21; Wm. Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 303-4, and *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam, 1964, pp. 126-27; Rubió i Lluch, "La Grecia catalana des de 1370 a 1377," *Anuaris de l'Institut d'Estudis catalans*, V (1913-14), 439-41; and cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* (1975), pp. 77-78.

Nerio Acciajuoli, the Florentine lord of Corinth, suddenly seized the Catalan castle of Megara,¹²⁵ which commanded the Isthmian road to Athens and Thebes, and through the years Greeks as well as Turks continued their constant harassment of the Athenian duchy.¹²⁶

On the ecclesiastical organization of the Catalan duchies of Athens and Neopatras we have a good deal of exact information although of course important questions remain unanswered. There were three provinces (those of Athens, Thebes, and Neopatras), over which the Latin "patriarch of Constantinople" theoretically presided, subject always to the papacy in Avignon and, finally, in Rome. The jurisdictions of the archbishops of Thebes and Neopatras lay entirely within Catalan territory, but that of his grace of Athens extended beyond the boundaries of the duchies. The history of the Latin Church in the East has always been complicated by the ghostly figures of titular bishops who hover about in the documents. Canonical tradition attached a bishop to his see, but he could not live in a diocese, however ancient, which had grown too poor to support him or had become occupied by infidels or schismatics who denied him residence. And of course such non-residence should not cost him the episcopal dignity. When adversity frustrates good intentions, it is a test of virtue, not a sign of reprobation; after all, S. Paul had been shipwrecked on his way to preach the gospel in Italy.

Titular bishops of occupied eastern sees were loath to abandon the rights and dignities of office, and such sees sometimes possessed valuable properties in Europe. Among the many galloping bishops raising dust on the roads of the fourteenth century some were titulars serving the papacy and the various orders on important diplomatic missions to lay and ecclesiastical authorities, and among the envoys and ecclesiastical counsellors of the Catalan kings of Sicily and Aragon we find titular bishops of sees in *partibus Graeciae* who never saw their cathedral churches, and probably had only a remote idea of where they were. An archbishop of Neopatras or a bishop of Zeitounion at the Curia Romana in Avignon plays no part in the history of Greece.

Although the papacy was hacking away at the capitular right of electing archbishops and bishops, the canons appear to have elected the Latin archbishops of Athens through the first half of the fourteenth century. The little chapter at Daulia seems to have elected their bishops even longer. The canons sometimes tried to maintain their right of election against the encroachments of the Curia, but when they succeeded, the incumbents' names have generally disappeared. Papal reservation and appointment to office have preserved the incumbents' names in the Vatican archival registers; hence we sometimes know the wrong people, for they never went to Greece.¹²⁷

As the Latin patriarch and the archbishops reacted against the restraint which the Curia sought to put upon their authority, they persisted in making nominations to the episcopate in Greece, sometimes even to cathedral churches which in fact no longer existed. In other words, they created titular bishops. An interesting example of this occurred in 1346 when Nicholas Salamon, the only Latin archbishop of Athens really known to us during the first half of the century,¹²⁸ appointed the

¹²⁷ Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII (1958), 19–20.

¹²⁸ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 115, incorrectly lists three archbishops of Athens from 1300 to 1345, by which time Nicholas Salamon had long occupied the cathedra (see Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 19, note, 24, who has overlooked Henry, the archbishop of Athens in 1305, for whom see G. Schlumberger, F. Chalandon, and A. Blanchet, *Sigillographie de l'Orient latin*, Paris, 1943, pp. 212–13). Nicholas Salamon was a Venetian. He became archbishop of Athens in 1328 (Loenertz, *op. cit.*, nos. 29, 31, 39, 41, 52, pp. 36–37, 38, 40; Giuseppe Giomo, *I "Misti" del Senato della Repub[b]lica veneta*, Venice, 1887, repr. Amsterdam, 1970, pp. 130, 222, where in the latter reference Salamon incorrectly appears as *archiepiscopus Thebanus*; and cf. Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber, vol. 85, 426a, repr. I, 360a). Nicholas died early in 1351, and was succeeded on 8 June by a certain John, archdeacon of Candia in Crete (Eubel, I, 115, and cf. Loenertz, *op. cit.*, nos. 120–21, 124, 137, 139, pp. 54–55, 58).

Upon his accession to the archiepiscopal throne of Athens, John had apparently seized Nicholas Salamon's property although the latter owed his brother Philip 4,000 *hyperperi*. On 14 March, 1353, Philip Salamon informed the Venetian Signoria "quod frater suus dominus archiepiscopus Athenarum diversis ex causis tenebatur sibi in bona et magna summa pecunie ad quantitatem yperperorum quattuor milia vel circa," as Philip could show from a statement written in the archbishop's own hand. He asked the Signoria to write to the Venetian ambassadors at the Curia Romana to help him recover the money with the aid of the apostolic legate in the East (Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 26, fol. 110^r, and cf. Hopf, *op. cit.*, p. 452b [repr. I, 386b], and Loenertz, *op. cit.*, nos. 127, 136, pp. 56, 58). Archbishop John died about the beginning of the year 1357.

¹²⁵ *Dipl.*, docs. CCCLIV, CCCXCI, pp. 440, 475.

¹²⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. DLXXV, p. 613, a letter of Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia, dated 17 July, 1385.

Carmelite friar Albert de Nogerio as bishop of Coronea (*Carminensis*), which was traditionally a suffragan see of Athens, but had clearly disappeared as a church, "lacking canons and clergy" (*canonicis et clero carens*). Owing to the "vacancy" caused by the death of the previous bishop of Coronea, Nicholas Salamon nominated Fra Albert to the vacuous dignity, and invited any and all who might wish to make objection to do so within eight days *coram nobis in domibus nostre habitationis Negroponte*, whence it is clear that the archbishop of Athens was then residing at Negroponte. Nicholas had asked Archbishop Philip of Thebes, himself a Carmelite and presumably Fra Albert's sponsor, to publish the "edict of election," which was done on 13 September (1346) by posting it for eight days on the portals of the new church at Thebes, where Fra Albert lived as a canon. On 25 September a notary prepared an affidavit, duly witnessed, which attested the posting of the notice (and has provided us with its text), and since no objection was made to Fra Albert's elevation, Nicholas doubtless proceeded to his consecration as bishop of Coronea.¹²⁹

The archbishop of Athens may conceivably have sought the Latin patriarch's confirmation of Fra Albert's election, but it is most unlikely that anyone informed the Curia in Avignon, where such an election would be considered invalid although the pope might well have proceeded himself to Fra Albert's election, to preserve the controverted principle of papal nomination to the episcopacy. But it was always possible for the Curia to learn of the vacancy at Coronea (when, for example, the attempt was made to collect the deceased incumbent's *spolia* which the Apostolic Camera would claim) without ever hearing of Fra Albert's elevation. The pope might then appoint a curial prelate or an auxiliary somewhere in Germany to the title, and a non-existent see would have two bishops, which explains the episcopal doublets which Loenertz has noted at Thermopylae (Boudonitza), Salona, Zeitounion, and probably at Megara.¹³⁰

¹²⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CXCI, pp. 248–49; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 104–5, p. 51.

¹³⁰ Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 21–22, who cites Boniface VIII's *Liber sextus*, lib. I, tit. VI, cap. XVIII, in the *Corpus iuris canonici*, eds. E. L. Richter and E. Friedberg, II (1879, repr. 1955), cols. 959–60, on the papal *eligendi potestas* to the episcopate; and on the "spoils," cf. W. E. Lunt, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, I (New York, 1934, repr. 1965), 103–7, *et alibi*. For "doublets" at Zeitounion (Lamia), see Loenertz, *op. cit.*, nos. 125–26, p. 56.

Athens casts a spell upon us all, and every period of her history excites interest. In the century preceding the Fourth Crusade the historic city had been accounted the twenty-eighth in order of hierarchical standing among the archiepiscopal sees in the Byzantine empire. The metropolitan authority of the Athenian archbishop had extended over eleven suffragan sees, which Nilos Doxapatres has identified for us (in 1142–1143) as: 1) Euripos (the ancient Chalcis, medieval Negroponte), 2) Daulia and 3) Coronea in Boeotia, 4) Andros, 5) Oreos at the northern tip of Euboea, 6) Skyros, 7) Carystus and 8) Porthmus, 9) Aulon, 10) Syros and Seriphos, and 11) Ceos (Zea, Kea) and Thermia (ancient Cythnus) in the Cyclades. Some time after Othon de la Roche took over the lordship of Athens in the fall of 1204, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, a certain Bérard was appointed the first Latin archbishop of Athens, probably in the summer of 1206. In November, 1206, and February, 1209, Pope Innocent III confirmed Bérard in all the authority which the Greek Metropolitan Michael Choniates (1182–1204) had just ceased to exercise over the churches and clergy of the Athenian province.¹³¹

The ecclesiastical administrator is as conservative as the theologian, and no sweeping changes were introduced into the titular structure of the Athenian Church during the whole century of Burgundian rule. On 13 February, 1209, Innocent III confirmed—he did not create—Bérard's rights and jurisdiction over the eleven suffragan sees of the province, now identified as: 1) Negroponte, 2) Thermopylae (Boudonitza), 3) Daulia, 4) Aulon, 5) Oreos, 6) Carystus, 7) Coronea, 8) Andros, 9) Megara, 10) Skyros, and 11) Ceos.¹³² Bérard had of course provided Innocent III with the detailed information contained in the confirmation; he may also have provided him with some of the rhetoric with which it is expressed. We need only compare Innocent's list of bishoprics sub-

¹³¹ Inn. III, an. IX, ep. 194 (*PL* 215, 1031), dated 27 November, 1206; Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, I (Berlin, 1874), no. 2922, p. 249; and Inn., an. XI, ep. 256 (*PL* 215, 1559), dated 13 February, 1209; Potthast, I, no. 3654, p. 315; Georg Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen*, Rome, 1934, pp. 187 ff.; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 9–10; Setton, *Catalan Domination* (1975), pp. 91 ff.; and see in general Jean Longnon, "L'Organisation de l'église d'Athènes par Innocent III," in *Mémorial Louis Petit*, Bucharest, 1948, pp. 336–46.

¹³² Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 256, ref. given in the preceding note, and see above, Chapter 16, pp. 407–8.

ject to Athens with that of Nilos Doxapatres to see how closely they correspond.¹³³ Nevertheless, life had changed a good deal in Athens. The Greek higher clergy were driven into exile, and the Fourth Crusaders rededicated the Parthenon, the Church of the Theotokos Atheniotissa, to the Latin S. Mary of Athens, and so it was destined to remain until the Turkish occupation of the city.

The archdiocese of Athens came under the jurisdiction of the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, but the authority and resources of the patriarchal see, which had once dared to resist Innocent III and Honorius III, had declined so unhappily that in May, 1241, Gregory IX had ordered a tithe to be paid to the Latin patriarch from the revenues of the cathedral churches, monasteries, and the clergy, both Latin and Greek, in the Morea, Negroponte, and the islands subject to the then see of Constantinople. The patriarchal dignity had sunk into such depressing penury that Gregory could not contemplate its plight without grief, "and yet there was no one willing or able to extend a helping hand."¹³⁴ With the fall of the Latin empire twenty years later (in 1261), a situation that could not get worse, alas, got much worse, until the death of the aged bishop of Negroponte, Gautier de Ray, a relative of the slain Duke Gautier I of Athens, led to a solution whereby the patriarchal dignity could be maintained. On 8 February, 1314, Clement V put the island see under the charge of the Latin patriarch,¹³⁵ who thus gained access to the revenues of Negroponte.

Although we have just seen something of Nicholas Salamon, the archbishops of Athens

are mere names to us through most of the fourteenth century. After Nicholas's death Pope Clement VI named John, archdeacon of Candia in Crete, to the archiepiscopal throne on the Acropolis (on 8 June, 1351).¹³⁶ A half-dozen years later (on 19 June, 1357), Innocent VI promoted one Nicholas de Raynaldo, Venetian sub-deacon and dean of Negroponte, whom the cathedral chapter had elected shepherd of the flock at Athens. But since John had died *extra Romanam curiam*, provision of the see was reserved to the pope; nevertheless Innocent accepted Nicholas de Raynaldo's elevation, and annulling the capitular action, named him anyway.¹³⁷ His successor was another Venetian, Fra Francis, a Minorite and provincial of the Order in Romania; he too was elected by the stubborn canons at Athens, *sed vox capituli non erat vox Dei*, and Urban V nullified their action; the see was reserved, but Urban appointed Fra Francis anyway (on 20 August, 1365).¹³⁸ Apparently an otherwise unknown John followed Francis (at a date likewise unknown); and John's successor was the Catalan Antonio Ballester, also a Franciscan, appointed by Urban V on 27 March, 1370.¹³⁹ Only with

¹³⁶ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 115; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 120–21, 124, pp. 54–55; Setton, *Catalan Domination* (1975), p. 94.

¹³⁷ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXXIII, pp. 306–7. The *servitium commune* of the Athenian archbishop-elect was 70 florins of gold (Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 137, 139–40, 142, pp. 58, 59). Nicholas de Raynaldo seems to have been somewhat obstreperous (*ibid.*, no. 152, p. 61).

¹³⁸ *Dipl.*, doc. CCLIX, pp. 343–44; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 159–61, 164, pp. 62, 63.

¹³⁹ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXVIII, pp. 405–6; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 169–70, p. 65. In the recruitment of suffragan bishops Antonio Ballester seems to have been partial to his fellow Franciscans (*ibid.*, nos. 189–90, pp. 68–69). He played a prominent part in eastern affairs as vicar of James Campanus d'Itri, Latin patriarch of "Constantinople" (from 18 January, 1376), formerly bishop of Ischia and archbishop of Otranto, whose knowledge of the Neapolitan Bartolommeo Prignani (Pope Urban VI), formerly bishop of Acerenza and Bari, led him to join the schism as soon as Robert of Geneva became Clement VII. James d'Itri was at Fondi when Clement was elected, and was one of the first to receive the red hat in Clement's creation of cardinals at Fondi on 16 or 18 December, 1378 (Eubel, I, 27, 206, 280; Mas Latrie, *ROL*, III [1895, repr. 1964], 441; *Vita Clementis VII*, in Baluze and Mollat, eds., *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I [1914], 473, with notices in vol. II [1927], 772–74). Like Don Pedro IV of Aragon, Antonio Ballester adhered to the Roman obedience. After James d'Itri's defection, Ballester must have been reappointed patriarchal vicar, and in February, 1384, we find him witnessing with two other Latin bishops Francesco Crispo's cession of the island of Andros to Pietro Zeno, . . . Antonio episcopo de Setines vicario zeneral de Urban

¹³³ See in general Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 9–17. The bishopric of Porthmus in Euboea seems to have disappeared before the Fourth Crusade, and so is not on the list which Bérard gave the Curia Romana.

¹³⁴ Gregory IX, an. XV, ep. 60, ed. Lucien Auvray, *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, fasc. 12 (Paris, 1910), no. 6035, col. 515. This text has already been cited in Chapter 3, where we have also noted that by 1236 the Latin patriarch had lost most of his revenues and other property as a result of constant warfare with the Greeks (*Reg. Grég. IX*, II, no. 3382, col. 506), and that in July, 1243, Innocent IV had echoed Gregory's lament of two years before to the effect that the once opulent Latin patriarchate was in a wretched state, "nec est qui velit vel valeat subsidii porrigere sibi manum . . ." (Élie Berger, ed., *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, I [Paris, 1884], no. 33, pp. 8–9).

¹³⁵ *Reg. Clem. V*, annus nonus, no. 10271, pp. 82–83; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 16–17 and no. 11, p. 33. The Church of Negroponte was thus removed from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Athens.

Antonio Ballester can the archiepiscopate of Athens during the Catalan era be said to have much of a history. Until his death in 1387 he was a conspicuous figure in Graeco-Latin affairs.¹⁴⁰

papa in tuto patriarcha de Constantinopoli . . . (Stefano Magno, *Annali veneti*, ed. Hopf, *Chron. græco-romanes* [1873], pp. 184–85), and if the document in question is dated “in anno a nativitate 1384 adi 2 fevrer,” perhaps it is not dated *more veneto*, and so should not be referred to the year 1385 (Loenertz, *op. cit.*, nos. 194, 221, 225).

Antonio Ballester's first important appearance on the historical stage was as one of the three interpreters representing the Latin Church when John V Palaeologus made his profession of Catholic faith in Rome in October, 1369 (for the sources, see K. M. Setton, “Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 [1956], 46–47, and note Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente francescano*, V [Quaracchi, 1927], 134–42).

¹⁴⁰ The exact date of Antonio Ballester's death is unknown. On 11 November, 1387, however, King John I of Aragon, who had abandoned his father's pro-Roman policy and accepted the Avignonese obedience, asked Clement VII to name Antonio Blasi (*Blasii*), O. Merc., archbishop of Athens, *cum . . . vacet . . . dicta ecclesia per obitum fratris Antonii Ballistarii ordinis fratrum Minorum* (*Dipl.*, doc. DCXVII, pp. 649–50), and the request was repeated on 18 January, 1388 (*ibid.*, doc. DCXIX, pp. 650–51). Since a false report of the death of Pedro de Pau, last governor of Catalan Athens, had reached the royal court about the same time (*ibid.*, doc. DCXVIII, p. 650, dated 16 November, 1387), Rubió i Lluch believed that the report of Antonio Ballester's demise was also untrue. But on 14 May, 1388, the Curia Romana at Avignon still believed that Ballester was dead, and Clement VII proceeded with Blasi's elevation to the see of Athens (*ibid.*, doc. DCXXIII, pp. 653–54). By this date the Acropolis had already fallen to the Florentine Nerio Acciajuoli, whose brother Angelo was a cardinal of the Roman obedience (Eubel, I, 24). A Catalan archbishop of Avignonese persuasion had become doubly anathema in Athens. Consequently on 12 July, 1389, King John wrote Clement VII requesting for “Archbishop Antonio of Athens” some benefice or other with or without the *cura animarum* in one or another Aragonese diocese, “sane cum venerabilis in Christo pater Anthonius Atheniensis archiepiscopus consiliarius noster dilectus propter varia guer-rarum discrimina que in partibus Romanie inferioris diutius vigerunt eius archiepiscopatu prefato privatus existat . . .” (*ibid.*, doc. DCXXIV, pp. 654–55).

There can no longer be any doubt that it was Blasi, and not Ballester, for whom the king was appealing (*cf.* Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 231, 233–34, 237, pp. 78, 79). Rubió i Lluch, *Dipl.*, in the notes on pp. 653, 662, and in *Los Catalanes en Grecia*, Madrid, 1927, pp. 277–78, recalls a letter which King John wrote his wife in May, 1390, describing a bibulous dinner at the Castell de Balsareny at which the archbishop of Athens allegedly spoke some Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (Joseph Coroleu, ed., *Documents historichs catalans del segle XIV*, Barcelona, 1889, p. 122), but the text is ambiguous as well as playful. Rubió associated a knowledge of Greek with Ballester's years at Negroponte and Athens, and so for him the “archbishop of Athens” was always Ballester (*cf.* *Dipl.*, doc.

A few years after the Frankish conquest of Attica, Pope Innocent III had been obliged to compel some of the Latin clergy to serve in person in the Parthenon and to reside in Athens,¹⁴¹ and we know that early in the fourteenth century the archbishop of Athens possessed the right to compel his suffragans to take up personal residence in their dioceses.¹⁴² If life in Athens was painful (and even the archbishop seems usually to have resided in Negroponte during the Catalan era), it must have been almost intolerable in Neopatras, where the archbishops also avoided residence for any length of time in their archdiocese. The best known of them was the Dominican friar Ferrer d'Abella. On 27 June, 1323, John XXII named him to the archiepiscopal see of Neopatras with the rank of bishop, and with high praise for his *litterarum scientia, vite munditia, morum elegantia, aliaque dona virtutum*.¹⁴³ Fra Ferrer came of a distinguished Aragonese family. Although he was a trusted friend and

DCXLVI, p. 675, dated 8 April, 1394). It must also have been Blasi, not Ballester, who crowned Don Martin I at Saragossa in April, 1399 (refs. in Setton, *Catalan Domination*, pp. 185–86), as Golubovich, *Bibl. bio-bibl.*, V (1927), 142, n. 2, noted long ago.

Finally, on 21 February, 1403, the Spanish pontiff Benedict XIII transferred “Antonius Dexart, O. Merc., archiepiscopus Atheniensis” to the Catalan see of Cagliari in Sardinia (according to Eubel, I, 157). This is presumably Antonio Blasi (Dexart?) since our credulity will not easily extend to the acceptance of two Mercedarians (O. Merc.), both named Antonio and both archbishops of Athens. Nevertheless, when on 17 April, 1403, King Martin I of Aragon thanked Benedict XIII for transferring Antonio, “formerly archbishop of Athens,” to the Church of Cagliari, he proposed the nomination of an Augustinian, Antonio de Casagemmes, to the now vacant (titular) see of Athens (*Dipl.*, doc. DCLXXIII, p. 696, and *cf.* doc. DCLXXIV). There are too many Antonios in the Athenian record.

After Ballester's death an archbishop of the Roman obedience was also appointed to the see of Athens when sometime in 1388 Urban VI named the Franciscan Gerard Boem (Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 232, 241–42, pp. 78, 80), for whom Bishop James of Argos served as administrative vicar for the year 1389–1390(?), in *quello anno che lo detto messere lo vescovo fu vicario della detta ecclesia di Athene* (Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II, *Florence*: doc. XLVIII, p. 256, and Lampros, *Aggrafa*, pt. III, doc. 4, p. 148, from Nerio Acciajuoli's will, on which note below).

¹⁴¹ Inn. III, an. XI, ep. 246 (*PL* 215, 1551–52); Potthast, *Regesta*, I, no. 3630, p. 313, dated 24 January, 1209.

¹⁴² *Dipl.*, doc. LXII, p. 78; *Reg. Clem. V*, annus octavus, no. 9153, p. 132, dated 23 March, 1313. The Holy See had obviously granted the archbishop of Athens “quod suffraganeos suos possit compellere ad faciendum in eorum ecclesiis residentiam personalem.”

¹⁴³ *Dipl.*, doc. CXXI, pp. 149–50, with note, and *cf.* Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 362.

servitor of King James II, the "expedition" of his appointment was delayed five years when he incurred the wrath of the excitable pope, "because he was not faithful to him and to the Church."¹⁴⁴ The pope detained him at Avignon, and in 1326 he is described as *impeditus, pauper et oppressus*; but James II and the Infante Don Alfonso exerted themselves on the friar's behalf, and sent him money to defray his expenses. At length owing to the continued insistence of Don Alfonso [IV], now king, Fra Ferrer could write on 24 June, 1328, that his Holiness had restored him to favor, and made him bishop in the archbishopric of Neopatras, "and he did this because, if I were an archbishop, he could not easily transfer me to churches in your kingdom."¹⁴⁵ Needless to add, Ferrer d'Abella never took up residence in Neopatras. On 28 September, 1330, he achieved his ambition of a bishopric under Catalan rule when he was transferred to Mazzara in Sicily, and in 1334 he received the see of Barcelona, where he died a decade later.¹⁴⁶

Fra Ferrer d'Abella continued to administer the see of Neopatras, however, from the day of his translation to Mazzara almost until the time of his death in December, 1344.¹⁴⁷ The church may have been well endowed, which would explain John XXII's thus granting it in *commendam* despite his own eloquent condemnation of the profits of pluralism in the well-known constitution *Exsecrabilis* of 21 November, 1317.¹⁴⁸ According to Loenertz, Fra Ferrer's successor as archbishop of Neopatras was James Mascó, who was dispensed from pay-

ment of the *servitium commune* on 30 November, 1344, which indicates that his appointment was recent.¹⁴⁹ In 1356 James Mascó, who may have been a curial prelate resident at Avignon, delivered a letter from Cardinal Pierre de Cros to Don Pedro IV of Aragon, who wrote the cardinal on 16 September, asking him to assist Mascó to further advancement and to use his influence to secure the lifting of the interdict from the duchies of Athens and Neopatras to confound the infidel Turks and the schismatic enemies of the Christian faith of Rome.¹⁵⁰

Upon the death of James Mascó, Pope Innocent VI appointed a Franciscan named Peter Fabri de Annoniaco as archbishop of Neopatras (on 9 August, 1361).¹⁵¹ Peter Fabri was followed by a certain Francis (1369?–1376), a Franciscan and possibly a curial prelate, whom we have met in connection with the proposed anti-Turkish congress at Thebes.¹⁵² When Francis died, Gregory XI appointed another Franciscan, Matthew, whom the cathedral chapter of Neopatras had already elected illegally, "perhaps in ignorance of the papal decree of reservation" (*reservationis et decreti forsan ignari*).¹⁵³

While the Curia was satisfied with this assertion of the papal *eligendi potestas*, the canons of Neopatras were doubtless gratified thus to receive an archbishop of their own choice. Matthew knew Greece, and he probably resided for some time at least in his archdiocese, for a document of 10 September, 1380, shows him

¹⁴⁴ Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 89, p. 48, and cf. no. 107, pp. 51–52.

¹⁴⁵ Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, III (1922), no. 205, pp. 451–52; *Dipl.*, doc. DCCIV, pp. 729–30, letter of Cardinal Napoleone Orsini to James II, dated at Avignon on 10 December, 1323.

¹⁴⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. CXL, pp. 171–72, and cf. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 19–22, 30, pp. 34–35, 36.

¹⁴⁷ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 331–32, 128; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 47, p. 39; Finke, *op. cit.*, I (1908), introd., pp. CLXXII–V. Fra Ferrer tried to keep the Aragonese king informed of the news he gathered in Avignon (Finke, II [1908], no. 297, pp. 444–46, letter dated 15 April, 1329).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Mollat, *Jean XXII (1316–1334): Lettres communes*, X (Paris, 1930), nos. 50991–92, dated 28 September, 1330: "Ferrarius, episcopus Mazariensis, fit administrator eccl. Neopatrensis, cuius prius erat episcopus. . . . Idem Ferrarius transfertur ex ecclesia Neopatrensi ad eccl. Mazariensem." Cf. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 47, 89, pp. 39, 48.

¹⁴⁹ The text of the constitution *Exsecrabilis* appears in John XXII's *Extravagantes*, tit. III, eds. Richter and Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici*, II, cols. 1207–9, and is translated in Lunt, *Papal Revenues*, II (1934, repr. 1965), 225–28.

¹⁵⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. CCXXX, p. 304; Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 134, pp. 57–58. Cardinal de Cros apparently did use his influence on behalf of the Grand Company, and on 3 December, 1358, Innocent VI relaxed the decrees of excommunication and raised the interdict for a year; in the meantime he had assigned the spiritual problem of the Company to a commission headed by Guillaume de Curte, cardinal bishop of Tusculum (*Dipl.*, doc. CCXXXV, pp. 309–10). Cf. above, p. 456.

¹⁵¹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Aven. 147 (Innocentius VI, an. IX, part. III, tom. XXVII), fol. 197: ". . . Nuper vero ecclesia Neopatrensis per obitum bone memorie Jacobi archiepiscopi Neopatrensis, qui apud dictam sedem diem clausit extremum, pastoris solacio desituta [est] . . .," the usual formula. See *Dipl.*, doc. CCXLVII, p. 329; Eubel, I, 362. Peter Fabri's letter of nomination to Neopatras thus states that James Mascó died in Avignon; his name, often given as *de Armoniaci*, appears correctly in Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 148, p. 60, as *de Annoniaco* (cf. Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum VIII* [Quaracchi, 1932], 168 and note).

¹⁵² *Dipl.*, docs. CCCXXXVI–VII, pp. 423, 425; Eubel, I, 362.

¹⁵³ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCLX, p. 445, dated 6 February, 1376.

traveling (presumably through Phocis) with John Boyl, titular bishop of Megara, who had hired two horses for the purpose. The impoverished state of the Latin episcopate is sadly illustrated by the fact that to pay for the horses John Boyl had borrowed twenty gold ducats from two Greek money lenders, Peter Moscho and "the son of Cahuni," who received as surety for the loan "a box full of books."¹⁵⁴ The last archbishop of Neopatrás of the Catalan period was one John de Royis (Rius?), an Augustinian, whom Clement VII named to the see on 7 August, 1382,¹⁵⁵ and who still held the title in 1390 when Neopatrás fell to the Florentine Nerio Acciajuoli.

An Aragonese document, dating from 1380–1381, furnishes us with a record of the episcopal clergy in the duchies of Athens and Neopatrás during the last decade of Catalan rule. The three archbishoprics are listed, those of Athens, Thebes, and Neopatrás. Antonio Ballester is identified as the archbishop of Athens, and under him were thirteen suffragan bishops, two more than in Michael Choniates' time. According to this list, however, only four of these thirteen bishops possessed sees located in the Athenian duchy, namely the bishops of Megara, Daulia (in Phocis), Salona (the ancient Amphissa), and Boudonitza (the ancient Thermopylae). But Megara was hardly in Catalan territory by this time, for Nerio Acciajuoli had seized the city in 1374. The archbishop of Thebes is said to have had no suffragan under him, and indeed he had trouble enough without suffragans, for the Navarrese had occupied his city about a year before this list was first composed. The archbishop of Neopatrás is said to have had under him only the bishop of Zeitounion (the ancient Lamia), whose see lay within the duchy of Neopatrás.¹⁵⁶ To the four

bishoprics listed as being in the Athenian duchy, however, we should add the titular see of Coronea in Boeotia,¹⁵⁷ and by 1380 Aegina had also become a bishopric. The Catholic hierarchy in the Catalan states in Greece thus consisted of three archbishops and seven bishops, and the Athenian metropolitan (with thirteen suffragans) was obviously an important prelate in central Greece.

One leaves the ecclesiastical documents of the fourteenth century with the impression that the grave friars who occupied the sometimes indigent sees in Greece strayed far less often from the narrow path of propriety than some of the reverend roisterers who followed the Fourth Crusaders. The documents are less concerned with clerical strife and disorder (of which we learn so much from the letters of Innocent III) than with the routines of business—papal nominations of archbishops and bishops, records of their payments of the *servitium commune* (the archbishop of Athens paid only 70 florins!), authorizations to borrow money to be repaid from the revenues of their sees, episcopal consecrations and translations from one see to another, the bestowal of the pallium, dispensations to non-resident clerics to collect the avails of office, concessions of indulgence, the threat or declaration of ecclesiastical censure, admonitions, absolutions, and so on. Such are the sources. If the casual reader could wish they were more exciting, the historian is thankful for what he has, and were it not for the stately registers which line the shelves of the Vatican Archives, Frankish Greece would have almost no ecclesiastical history.

On 27 July, 1377, Frederick III, king of Sicily and duke of Athens and Neopatrás, died in Messina, the last of the male line of the Catalan dynasty in Sicily. He had wished to leave both his kingdom and the duchies to his young daughter Maria although the will of

¹⁵⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. CDIII, pp. 490–91. King Pedro IV directed Luis Fadrique (old Don Alfonso's grandson), then serving as vicar-general, to see to the restoration of John Boyl's books or their full value when the loan had been repaid.

¹⁵⁵ Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, nos. 214, 220, 223, 228, pp. 74 ff. Michel Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, III (Paris, 1740), cols. 1015–16, gives the name Rius. Rubió i Lluch's *Diplomatari* contains four references to Archbishop John, no one of which supplies his surname (*Dipl.*, docs. DLV, p. 599 [13 December, 1383], DLXVII, p. 607 [6 September, 1384], DLXXXIII, p. 610 [12 December, 1384], and DCVI, p. 641 [17 April, 1387]). The Franciscan John de Montelupone may have been titular archbishop of Neopatrás in June, 1394 (Loenertz, *op. cit.*, no. 250, p. 82).

¹⁵⁶ *Dipl.*, doc. CDLXXXIX, pp. 547–48. A papal document of 18 January, 1353, makes the see of Zeitounion subject to the archbishop of Thebes (*Dipl.*, doc. CCX, pp. 287–88),

while another of 6 March of the same year seems to place Zeitounion under the archbishop of Athens (*ibid.*, doc. CCXI, pp. 289–90). There was obviously some confusion in the Avignonese chancery at this time concerning the status of Zeitounion.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *Dipl.*, doc. CXCI, pp. 248–49, dated 25 September, 1346, in which document the Carmelite friar Albert de Nogerio is declared to have succeeded the deceased Fra Antonio as bishop of the *ecclesia Carminensis . . . Atheniensi ecclesiae suffraganea et immediate subiecta*. The hitherto mysterious *ecclesia Carmensis, de Carino*, later *Carminensis* (cf. Setton, *Catalan Domination*, pp. 93–94, note 46) is actually the bishopric of Coronea (*Coroniensis*), as shown by Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, 12–13.

Frederick II (d. 1337) had expressly excluded the women of his house from the royal succession. King Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia therefore laid claim both to Sicily and to the Catalan states in Greece. Maria eventually married Don Pedro's grandson Martin, and so the rival dynastic claims were united, but in the meantime there were succession struggles in Sicily, and possibly in Greece, from 1377 to 1379, and before Don Pedro became duke of Athens and Neopatras, the Catalans suddenly lost Thebes. In the late spring of 1379 the city was seized by a band of mercenaries known as the "Navarrese Company," which also took Livadia by force toward the end of 1380 or the beginning of 1381. This company of freebooters, which probably included as many Gascons and Italians as Navarrese, was aided by "traitors" to the Crown of Aragon within the walls of both strongholds. The history of the last decade or so of Catalan domination in continental Greece (1379-1390) can be written in detail from more than 250 documents, the large number of which attests to the concern of both Don Pedro IV and his son John I for the affairs of their tottering duchies.

When the shock of the Navarrese occupation of Thebes had subsided, a parliament was assembled in Athens (possibly in the Parthenon), to which were summoned the syndics, aldermen, and council of the municipal corporation (*sindichs, prohoms e consell dela dita universitat*). The assembly prepared a petition, the "Articles of Athens," dated 20 May, 1380, containing some sixteen or seventeen requests, the acceptance or rejection of which by Don Pedro IV would define the terms under which the chief officers and citizens of Athens would become vassals and subjects of the Crown. Only four or five of these requests related to matters of public interest; the others sought rewards for prominent persons who had proved their loyalty to the Crown at the time of the Navarrese invasion. The most interesting general request concerns the Church. The petitioners asked for the revocation of the statute or statutes which the Conquistadors had passed decades before "against the soul's true conscience and against the Church of the Catholic faith," forbidding the faithful to leave the Church "estates, lands, vineyards, as well as other things" or even to free serfs from their harsh bondage to the soil (*e encara que puxen afranquir lurs vilans et vilanes de tota servitut de vilanatge . . .*). Hitherto the Catalans had used

property bestowed upon the Church, in violation of the statutes of the Company, to maintain or extend the Acropolis fortifications. When at Lérida on the following 1 September (1380) Don Pedro confirmed or modified one by one the various items in the petition, he rejected this plea on behalf of the Church, reminding the Catalans in Athens that they were few in number (*com hi ha poca gent nostrada*), and if they began leaving their possessions to the Church, they would soon lack the men and resources necessary to defend the duchies, "for ecclesiastics are not soliders, and they are not under the jurisdiction of the lord king." Don Pedro said that a like restriction against legacies to the Church obtained in his kingdoms of Valencia and Majorca, but when his newly appointed vicar-general, Felipe Dalmau, the eminent viscount of Rocaberti, arrived in Greece, he would make whatever provisions for the Church were consistent with the public interest.¹⁵⁸

Of the two envoys who carried the Athenian petition to King Pedro IV in Catalonia, one was Bishop John Boyl of Megara, who clearly made a favorable impression on the king. In fact Don Pedro now tried (on 10 September, 1380) to secure his appointment to the archbishopric of Thebes, which was a lucrative see with an income about four times that of Athens.¹⁵⁹ Nerio Acciajuoli had of course occupied Meg-

¹⁵⁸ The text of the Articles of Athens may be found in Rubió i Lluch, *Los Navarros en Grecia*, Barcelona, 1886, doc. XXXII, pp. 241-51, and in the *Diplomatari*, doc. CCCXCII, pp. 473-79, with the items concerning the Church on pp. 476-77. At Lérida on 1 September, 1380, King Pedro IV also confirmed the requests contained in the "Articles of Salona," which had been prepared on 31 May, 1380, on behalf of Don Luis Fadrique, lord of Salona and count of Malta. Petitions had also been prepared at Salona for presentation to the king by the refugee "municipal corporation" of Thebes (on 22 May) and by the "universitat" of Livadia (on 1 June, and for these dates, see *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXCII, p. 481), the two latter documents having perished, although the Articles of Salona are still extant (Rubió, *Los Navarros*, doc. XXXIX, pp. 256-59, and *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXCII, pp. 480-82). Cf. in general Setton, *Catalan Domination* (1975), pp. 158-64, and Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXV, nos. 167-72, 175-77, pp. 143-45, 171-72. On 6 October, 1380, five weeks after dealing with the Athenian petitions, Don Pedro IV repeated his prohibition against selling, giving, or bequeathing property or rents to the Church, although donations in money might be made (*Dipl.*, doc. CDXXXIII, p. 508).

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Eubel, *Hierarchia*, I, 114, 482, and Hermann Hoberg, "Die Servientaxen der Bistümer im 14. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXXIII (1944), 130.

ara a half-dozen years before, and the Navarrese Company had taken Thebes during the spring of the preceding year. But presumably John Boyl thought the Catalans could recover Thebes, and in the meantime Don Pedro wanted him to receive the annual income of twenty-four gold ducats accruing from "the chapel of S. Bartholomew in the palace of the castle of Athens" as well as the allowance he was already getting for himself and two servitors.¹⁶⁰ The palace on the Acropolis was built into the Propylaea, and the lines of the chapel may still be seen east of the so-called Pinakothek.

John Boyl and his fellow envoy told Don Pedro about the Navarrese invasion, the loss of Thebes, and the danger to which Athens and other Catalan strongholds were still exposed. They doubtless identified various "traitors to the sacred Crown of Aragon," but we have no way of knowing how accurately they recounted the facts. Among the alleged traitors was Simon Atumano, archbishop of Thebes, whom John Boyl obviously wished to replace in the *cathedra*, and on 11 September (1380) Don Pedro wrote Pope Urban VI, accusing Simon of acting in collusion with the Navarrese:

Most holy Father: We are assured that owing to the machinations and efforts of the archbishop of the city of Thebes—which together with other cities, castles, and places in the duchies of Athens and Neopatras now belong to our dominion—the said city was captured by our enemies, and even now is being held by them on the advice of the archbishop himself. As a result of this, evils and scandals without number have occurred in the said duchies, and there is no doubt that on this account the archbishop himself has sinned against the Church of God and against our royal Majesty. But this need not astonish us, for the archbishop was born in Constantinople, and his father was a Turk, his mother a schismatic [Greek], and while he was a Greek monk [*calogerus*, *καλόγῆρος*] because of terrible vices which we forbear even to mention on account of their enormity, in which vices [Simon Atumano] still persists, he would have been burned at the stake, had he not secretly removed himself to other parts [to Italy?]

¹⁶⁰ *Dipl.*, doc. CCCXCVI, pp. 486–87, from Pedro IV to the vicar-general Rocaberti: concerning John Boyl's nomination to the Theban see, the king says that "hajam escrit al sant pare" (Urban VI). Boyl's tenure as bishop of Megara is unknown to Eubel, I, 333. The other envoy who joined Boyl in presenting the Athenian petition to Don Pedro was Gerardo (Guerau) de Rodonella: they took the oath of fealty and did homage to Pedro as "king, prince, duke, and lord" (*Dipl.*, doc. CCCXCI, p. 479).

where parading himself as a man of honor with false representations, as experience now makes evident, he obtained the aforesaid archbishopric from the lord Pope Gregory XI. But, most clement Father, since it is repugnant to divine and human laws alike that such an evil man be sustained in so great a dignity, we humbly beseech your Holiness that it please you to deprive the archbishop, if thus he deserves to be called, of this dignity, for we could in no wise allow him to reside in the said duchies. . . ."¹⁶¹

Don Pedro repeated his request for the transference to the Theban see of Bishop John Boyl, "who has suffered many ills in his own person for the defense of Christians." In two other letters of the same date (11 September, 1380) he asked, first, that John Boyl be appointed apostolic legate in the duchies of Athens and Neopatras as well as in the neighboring provinces of Romania (which would have meant the virtual displacement of Archbishop Antonio Ballester of Athens as vicar of the so-called patriarchate of Constantinople) and, secondly, that the interdict be lifted from the newly acquired dominions of Aragon in Greece.¹⁶²

The medieval historian is confined to the cloister of his sources, and when imagination leads him to escape the confinement, he usually walks the perilous path of invention, but it is reasonable to assume that John Boyl told Don Pedro something about the extraordinary buildings with which he had become familiar in Athens. He asked the king for a guard of ten or a dozen men-at-arms for the Acropolis, and the treasurer of Aragon was promptly informed that his Majesty was sending twelve well-equipped crossbowmen to Athens to serve for four months, by which time (he said) the new vicar-general, Rocaberti, should be on his way to Greece. In the meantime the Acropolis

¹⁶¹ *Dipl.*, doc. CDVI, pp. 492–93. On Simon Atumano, see Giovanni Mercati, *Se la Versione dall'ebraico del codice veneto greco VII sia di Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe: Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell'Atumano*, Rome, 1916 (*Studi e testi*, no. 30); Giorgio Fedalto, *Simone Atumano, monaco di studio, arcivescovo latino di Tebe, secolo XIV*, Brescia, 1968; Setton, "Byzantine Background," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 100 (1956), 47–52; and A. K. Eszer, *Das abenteuerliche Leben des Johannes Laskaris Kalopheros*, Wiesbaden, 1969, pp. 115–17, 207–12. Simon Atumano was not appointed archbishop of Thebes by Gregory XI, but by Urban V (1362–1370). Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 206, p. 72, regards the charges of gross immorality made against Atumano as highly improbable.

¹⁶² *Dipl.*, docs. CDVI–CDVIII, pp. 493–94.

needed the reinforcement, "especially as the said castle is the richest jewel there is in the world and such that all the kings of Christendom could not create its equal!"¹⁶³

During the second week of August, 1381, after prolonged delays which irritated his royal master, the viscount of Rocaberti left Barcelona with two galleys for the long journey to Greece, whence he returned home the following spring. There is no evidence that he effected any notable improvement in the lot of his countrymen overseas, and subsequent events suggest that he did not make their position any more secure. Despite the availability of some fifty pertinent documents, we are still unable to determine who held Thebes and Livadia during the years 1382–1383. Don Pedro IV wrote Pope Urban VI on 31 December, 1382, that after the union of the duchy of Athens to the Crown of Aragon the intrigues of certain dissidents had caused a shameful rebellion against his authority. He implied that this might be the reason for laying the interdict upon the duchy, which was certainly not the case (but Urban had no access to the archives in Avignon). Now, however, all the inhabitants of the duchy had of their own accord recognized the error of their ways and returned to the Aragonese obedience, and so the interdict was no longer necessary. Don Pedro asked his Holiness to remove the ban and restore his "faithful subjects" to the loving embrace of the Church. The bearer of the royal letter was to be Bishop John Boyl of Megara, who was now leaving Catalonia and setting out for Rome. The king noted that John Boyl would provide the pope with more information about these matters,¹⁶⁴ and presumably he did, but of

course no record is preserved of what he said at the Curia. The king made a further attempt to have Simon Atumano removed from the archiepiscopal see of Thebes, and again recommended John Boyl's nomination thereto,¹⁶⁵ although the request was no more successful this time than it had been two years before.¹⁶⁶ Probably John Boyl made a better impression on the Aragonese court, where he could speak Catalan, than on the Curia Romana, for he may never have learned the Italian vernacular. But in any event Simon Atumano was then in Rome, and he could defend himself before the pope, who knew him. Simon had clearly not remained in Thebes very long after the Navarrese occupation of the city, even though (as we have seen) Don Pedro had accused him of acting in collusion with the invaders.

Simon Atumano is a notable figure in the history of biblical and classical scholarship. A very important Greek manuscript in the Laurenziana in Florence (Cod. 32, 2), which was once his property, contains tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides as well as the *Works and Days* of Hesiod. Notes written on the first folio of this manuscript, in Simon's own hand, have preserved autobiographical data of much interest:

On 23 June of the year 6856 [i.e. 1348] of the first indiction, I became bishop of Gerace in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. On 13 July of the same year and same indiction, I was advanced to sacred minor orders by my most holy lord Bertrand [du Poujet], cardinal of Ostia of God's holy Church of Rome, in the monastery of S. Andrew near Avignon in the place called Villeneuve. . . . On 6 December of the second indiction, in the year 6857 [still 1348], on Saturday, through the special grace granted by his Holiness, Pope Clement VI, for my ordination, I was ordained a priest by the bishop of Vabres [Pierre d'Aigrefeuille] in the church of S. Catherine in Avignon. On the seventh day of the same month, on Sunday, I was consecrated bishop in

¹⁶³ *Dipl.*, doc. CDIV, p. 491, dated 11 September, 1380: ". . . majorment com lo dit castell sia la pus richa joya qui al mont [i.e. món] sia, e tal que entre tots los reys de cristians envides lo porien fer semblant." Cf. F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte d. Stadt Athen im Mittelalter* . . . , trans. and ed. by Sp. P. Lampros, 2 vols., Athens, 1904, II, 194–95; Rubió i Lluch, "Significació de l'elogi de l'Acropolis d'Atenes pel Rei Pere'l Ceremoniós," in the *Homenaje ofrecido a [D. Ramón] Menéndez Pidal*, Madrid, 1925, III, 37–56, and *Los Catalanes en Grecia* (1927), pp. 131–37; Setton, *Catalan Domination*, pp. 187–88. On the dispatch of the twelve crossbowmen from Catalonia to Athens, see *Dipl.*, doc. CDXXVII, p. 505, dated 29 September, and docs. CDXXVIII–CDXXXI, CDXXXV, pp. 505–7, 509, dated 5, 6, and 11 October, 1380.

¹⁶⁴ *Dipl.*, doc. DXXXVII, p. 587: ". . . omnes dicti ducatus tanquam nostri fideles eorum recognoscentes errorem spontanei ad nostram obedienciam et dominium redierunt. . . ." The statement is simple enough, but the

meaning is unclear. Loenertz, *Arch. FF. Praed.*, XXVIII, no. 216, p. 75, says "le document semble impliquer que Thèbes et Livadia sont rentrées sous la domination catalane, fait important . . .," and the fact would be important if it were true, but a royal letter of 10 April, 1383 (*Dipl.*, doc. DXLIH, p. 592), certainly shows that by that date the "city and district of Thebes" had not returned to Catalan rule. In reference to the king's letter of 31 December, 1382, Loenertz, *loc. cit.*, speaks of "l'interdit qui pèse sur les duchés grecs," but the text specifies the duchy of Athens, and the interdict did not fall upon that of Neopatra.

¹⁶⁵ *Dipl.*, doc. DXXXVIII, p. 588, dated 31 December, 1382.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. *Dipl.*, docs. CCCXCVI, CDVI, CDXIII.

the church of the Dominicans by the most eminent cardinal of Embrun [Bertrand de Déaux]. . . .¹⁶⁷

Simon Atumano remained for some years bishop of Gerace in the far south of the Italian peninsula when, owing to the mistaken assumption in Avignon that Bishop John de Papasidero of Cassano was dead, Simon was named to his see, which (like Gerace) was a suffragan diocese of Reggio Calabria. But John was still alive, and so on 8 July, 1363, Pope Urban V allowed Simon to retain the bishopric and revenues of Gerace (which he had feared to lose because of the unfortunate misunderstanding) until he could take possession of the see of Cassano.¹⁶⁸ Bishop John's death must have seemed imminent, however, because on 5 August (1363) Urban V acted favorably upon a petition presented to him by his "humble creature Simon of Constantinople, bishop of Cassano," who among other requests asked for the *licentia testandi* for properties of the church of Cassano.¹⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Simon remained bishop of Gerace until his nomination on 17 April, 1366, to the see of Thebes, whose archbishop, Paulus, was named Latin patriarch of Constantinople on the same day.¹⁷⁰

By the time Don Pedro's emissary John Boyl

arrived at the Curia, Simon Atumano had become a familiar figure in intellectual circles in Rome, as he had been in earlier years at Avignon, where he had taught Greek. Thus in August, 1373, Francesco Bruni, who had been a papal secretary for more than ten years, had written a friend in Florence:

Thanks to the reverend father [Simon Atumano] . . . , the lord archbishop of Thebes, I learned to read and write Greek in a superficial way after I came to this Curia as an old man. He was and is modest, grave, and pleasant in manner, witty in speech, and of great reputation. I became intimate with him, and because of his friendship at that time he was constantly at my house, and so, as I have said, he chose [to teach me], even compelled me to learn Greek, that is the barest elements. He did so with good nature, kindness, and charm of speech and companionship.¹⁷¹

Simon Atumano was well established in Rome by the time John Boyl got there (early in the year 1383). Simon would gladly teach, and apparently had been doing so for some two years either as a public lecturer or as a private tutor. During the winter of 1381–1382 he had given instruction in Greek to Radulph de Rivo (d. 1403), the well-known dean of Tongres.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁷ A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Laurentianae*, II (Florence, 1768), col. 123; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Analecta Euripidea*, Berlin, 1875, pp. 5–6; Francesco Lo Parco, *Gli ultimi oscuri anni di Barlaam e la verità storica sullo studio del greco di Francesco Petrarca*, Naples, 1910, pp. 16–17, note 5, and pp. 35–36; Giovanni Mercati, *Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe* (1916), pp. 23–24, 27–28, 47–48, with an emended Greek text of Simon's entries in the manuscript; Fedalto, *Simone Atumano, monaco di studio* (1968), pp. 21–22. On the MS., cf. Aleksander Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, New York, 1943, p. 74, who thinks Simon was "bishop of Avignon." Simon had obviously received only the *prima tonsura* by June, 1348, when Clement VI nominated him bishop of Gerace.

¹⁶⁸ Michel Hayez et al., eds., *Urbain V (1362–1370), Lettres communes*, II, fasc. 2 (Paris, 1965), no. 6391, p. 202. It is probably safe to assume that Simon spent as much time at Avignon and as little at Gerace as possible.

¹⁶⁹ Arch. Segr. Vaticano, Reg. Suppl. 40, fol. 13, published by R. J. Loenertz, *Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance*, II (Città del Vaticano, 1960), 431–32 (Studi e testi, no. 208). In a letter to Simon Atumano, apparently written in the summer of 1364, Demetrius Cydonès alludes to Urban V's translation of Simon from Gerace to another city, "which like a ship had need of a stronger pilot," ὡς πλοῦν κυβερνήτου μείζονος δεομένην (Loenertz, *ibid.*, I [1956], bk. x, ep. 93, p. 126, lines 16–18 [Studi e testi, no. 186]).

¹⁷⁰ Eubel, I, 206, 482; Mercati, *Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe* (1916), pp. 30 ff.; Fedalto, *Simone Atumano, monaco di studio* (1968), pp. 34–36, 82, 91 ff.

¹⁷¹ Gene Brucker, "An Unpublished Source on the Avignones Papacy: The Letters of Francesco Bruni," *Traditio*, XIX (1963), 368. Francesco Bruni was appointed secretary by Urban V, and entered upon his duties at the *officium litterarum secretarum* on 3–4 February, 1363, with an annual salary of 200 florins (K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter den Päpsten Urban V. und Gregor XI. [1362–1378]*, Paderborn, 1937, pp. 23–24, 27, 75, 76, 111, 112, 155, etc., 225, 227, 253, etc., 606). When on 8 November, 1367, the pope suspended all Florentines from curial posts, Francesco Bruni, his son, and Giovanni Baroncelli were denoted as the sole exceptions to the papal decree (*ibid.*, p. 33). On Bruni, who was a correspondent of Petrarch, see especially H. J. Tomaseth, "Die Register und Secretäre Urbans V. und Gregors XI.," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XIX (1898), 423, 425, 440, 448, 452–63, with a few addenda and corrigenda in Gottfried Opitz, "Die Sekretärsexpedition unter Urban V. und Gregor XI.," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXXIII (1944), 167–70. Bruni became gonfalonier of justice in Florence for October and November, 1383, and died shortly after 1385 (Tomaseth, *op. cit.*, pp. 462–63).

¹⁷² Cunibert Mohlberg, *Radulph de Rivo, der letzte Vertreter der altrömischen Liturgie*, 2 vols., Louvain and Münster in Westf., 1911–15, I, 19–21, 214, who knows, however, little about Simon Atumano; see also Setton, "Byzantine Background," p. 49, and on Simon's Latin translation of Plutarch's *De cohibenda ira*, note, *ibid.*, pp. 50–51, and Robert Aulotte, *Amyot et Plutarque: La Tradition des Moralia au XVI^e siècle*, Geneva, 1965, pp. 22, 331.

In fact it is not impossible, as the late Cardinal (then Mons.) Giovanni Mercati once suggested, that Simon was appointed a curial professor of Greek (and Hebrew?) by Urban VI, to whom he dedicated his *Biblia Triglotta*, of which a partial Greek translation of the Old Testament still survives in Simon's first-draft, autograph manuscript, once the possession of Cardinal Bessarion. It may still be seen in Venice, in the Biblioteca Centrale Marciana (Cod. gr. VII).¹⁷³ Incidentally, to go with his Greek translation of the Old Testament, Simon also prepared for scholarly or missionary purposes a Hebrew version of the New Testament, which was (at least in part) still extant in the year 1516.¹⁷⁴ And he was probably still at work on the *Biblia Triglotta* when on 29 May, 1383, Urban VI provided him with a letter of safe conduct for a mission to Constantinople which was envisaged as possibly lasting a year. When Simon died (before 1387), Urban is said to have taken possession of the *Biblia*,¹⁷⁵ suggesting that the esteem in which he was held at the Curia was too much for John Boyl to combat.

By this time Simon's archiepiscopal city of Thebes, together with nearby Livadia, had passed into the hands of the Florentine adventurer Nerio Acciajuoli, who on 2 May, 1388, took the Acropolis of Athens after a lengthy siege. Nerio seems to have acquired Neopatras also, but if so, he did not hold it for long. Sultan Bayazid I invaded central Greece at the turn of the years 1393–1394. Ottoman troops occupied Neopatras and Livadia, and seized the so-called "county" of Salona (the ancient Amphissa) together with its dependencies of Zeitounion (Lamia), Loidoriki, and Veteranitza. The Catalan states in continental Greece were thus obliterated by the Navarrese, Florentines, and Turks. In the confusion of the mid-1390's however, the Catalan family of the Caupenas acquired the lordship of Aegina, which they held until 1451 when the last lord, disregarding the claims of relatives, bequeathed the island to Venice.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ It was first published a century ago by Oscar Gebhardt and Fr. Delitzsch, *Graecus Venetus: Pentateuchi Proverbiorum Ruth Cantici Ecclesiastae Threnorum Danielis versio graeca. Ex unico bibliothecae S. Marci Venetae codice* . . . , Leipzig, 1875. On Simon Atumano's humanistic and Hebrew studies, see Fedalto, *Simone Atumano*, pp. 109 ff.

¹⁷⁴ Mercati, *Simone Atumano*, pp. 12–43.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, doc. III, pp. 50–51, and pp. 16–17.

¹⁷⁶ See in general K. M. Setton, *Los Catalanes en Grecia*, Barcelona, 1975, pp. 174–79, 192 ff.

Nerio Acciajuoli died on 25 September, 1394, having dictated his last will and testament at Corinth eight days before. By a rather quixotic gesture, which bespeaks a troubled spirit, he left "to the Church of S. Mary of Athens the city of Athens with all its appurtenances and effects."¹⁷⁷ Since S. Mary and the cathedral staff of the Parthenon would have trouble defending their inheritance, he placed the city under the protection of Venice. Nerio's bequest of the city of Athens to the Latin Church was another cross to bear for the Greek metropolitan Macarius, whose predecessor, Dorotheus, Nerio had expelled from the city two years before, accusing him of treacherous dealings with the Turks. In March, 1393, the Holy Synod of Constantinople, sitting under the Patriarch Antonius, had held Dorotheus guiltless, and recalled that ever since the Latin conquest of Athens at a time which had long before passed from the memory of living men no elected metropolitan of Athens—until Dorotheus—had dared reside in Athens under the alien tyranny of the Burgundians, Catalans, and now the Florentines. But the Greek divines of their synodal wisdom sang the praises of the Athenian people who had kept their Orthodox faith unsullied although they had been left *anepiskopoi* for generations, "each the steward of his own faith," as the harsh regimes had forced the Greeks as it were to seek salvation by stealth and without instruction.¹⁷⁸

There was discord in the Greek hierarchy, nevertheless, and although the patriarch and the Holy Synod in Constantinople were in no position to assert their authority, they were obviously dissatisfied with the Athenian Metropolitan Macarius's exercise of his pastoral office in Athens.¹⁷⁹ The Venetians, who had taken over the city in accordance with the terms of Nerio's will, were even more dissatisfied, for Macarius's anti-Latin sentiments were leading him into the Turkish camp. The bailie of Negroponte sent worrisome reports to the Senate. Athens was threatened as well as Ne-

¹⁷⁷ Nerio's will, dated at Corinth on 17 September, 1394, may be found in Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques*, II (1845), *Florence*: doc. XLVIII, pp. 254–61, and Lampros, *Aggrafa*, pt. III, doc. 4, pp. 146–52.

¹⁷⁸ Fr. Miklosich and Jos. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, II (1862, repr. 1968): *Acta patriarchatus Constantinopolitani*, doc. 435, pp. 165–70; D. Gr. Kampouroglous, *History of the Athenians* (in Greek), II (Athens, 1890), 147.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca*, II, docs. 493–94, 498, pp. 250, 256, 259.

groponte, but the plodding efforts of Venetian envoys and officials could find no answer to the perennial question of Turkish assault.¹⁸⁰ When the Metropolitan Macarius kept playing fast and loose with the Turks, however, the Venetian authorities could do something about him. Macarius was arrested, sent to Venice, and imprisoned, but it would appear from a papal letter that as of May, 1396, he was still trying to deal with the Turks from his place of confinement on the lagoon.¹⁸¹ It is sometimes stated that the Turks occupied the lower city of Athens in the spring or summer of 1397, although the evidence for assuming so is hardly conclusive.¹⁸² It is of course quite possible. The Turks did take Argos on 3 June, 1397, sacked and burned the city, and are said to have carried off 14,000 persons into slavery.¹⁸³ Meet-

ings of the Venetian Senate were sad occasions as the news kept coming throughout the spring and summer of 1398 that the Turks were also harassing Negroponte and the Aegean islands,¹⁸⁴ and that a serious plague was sweeping through the Morea and through Crete, where "multi et multi mortui sunt."¹⁸⁵ It was the sixth great pestilence to strike the Morea and the islands in the half century since the Black Death.

During these years Athens lay under Venetian authority (from the end of 1394 to the beginning of 1403) and, one after the other, four "podestà and captains of our city of Athens" governed Attica on the Republic's behalf. Nerio Acciajuoli had left his bastard son Antonio the city of Thebes and the castle of Livadia, which suggests that the first Turkish occupation of Livadia was very brief. Antonio was never reconciled, however, to the Venetians' taking over Athens, and he harassed them incessantly. In the summer of 1402 he occupied the lower city, defeated a large Venetian force under the bailie of Negroponte, and took the Acropolis about January or February, 1403. Antonio's reign of some thirty-three years (until 1435) as "lord of Athens, of Thebes, of all the duchy and its dependencies" (ἀνθέντης Ἀθηνῶν, Θηβῶν, παντὸς δουκιάμου καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς) lies beyond the scope of this volume. Nevertheless, we may note that after his death three more members of the Acciajuoli family—Nerio II, Antonio II, and Franco—

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 43, fol. 76^r, senatorial resolution dated 3 August, 1395: "Quia consideratis novis habitis de partibus Nigropontis de pessima intencione et dispositione quam Turchi habent tam ad civitatem et insulam nostram predictam quam ad civitatem Athenarum . . . est habenda provisio principaliter ad duo . . .," i.e. maintenance of the grain supply and a sufficient force of infantry against the Turks. In February, 1396, Venice sent an embassy to Sultan Bayazid I (*ibid.*, fols. 107^v–109^f), seeking among other accommodations the security of Argos and Nauplia, and noting that "intromissimus etiam civitatem Athenarum quia dominus Nerius civis noster [he was an honorary citizen] ita per suum testamentum ultimum ordinavit . . ." (fol. 108^v), which was, alas, not strictly the truth although the historian Laonicus Chalcocondylas, IV (Bonn, p. 213; ed. E. Darkó, I [Budapest, 1922], 200), repeats the Venetian propaganda. Cf. F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, I (Paris, 1958), no. 896, pp. 210–11.

¹⁸¹ Commemoriali, IX, fol. 15, ed. R. Predelli, *Regesti dei Commem.*, III (Venice, 1883), no. 25, p. 238, dated 27 May.

¹⁸² Late Turkish sources place the obviously brief (if true) occupation of the lower city of Athens both before and after the battle of Nicopolis (25 September, 1396). Since some of these sources, however, identify Timurtash Pasha as the "conqueror" of the city, and since the also late but generally reliable *Chronicon breve*, ad ann. 6905, appended to Ducas's *Hist. byzantina* (Bonn, p. 516) places Timurtash Pasha's Moreote campaign in June, 1397 (when Argos was taken), J. H. Mordtmann, "Die erste Eroberung von Athen durch die Türken zu Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher*, IV (1923), 346–50, would date the so-called first Turkish occupation of Athens in 1397. Timurtash Pasha appears as Μουρτάσης in the text of the *Chronicon breve*, which does not mention any sojourn of Turkish forces in Athens, and (more to the point) the Venetian Senate seems to have known nothing about it.

¹⁸³ The fall of Argos to the Turks was known in Venice by 5 July (Misti, Reg. 44, fol. 10^f): "Castellanis nostris Coroni et Mothoni scribatur qualiter displicenter audivimus casum ammissionis civitatis nostre Argolicensis . . .," which posed a threat to Coron and Modon (cf. Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 936, p. 219). See Chalcocondylas, *Hist.*, II (Bonn, pp. 97–99), and Gregorovius-Lampros, *Athens*, II

(1904), 265. The Venetians had been cautiously pressing anti-Turkish plans upon King Sigismund of Hungary and the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II (Thiriet, I, nos. 931–32, p. 218). By a decree of the Senate of 27 July, 1399, all the remaining inhabitants of Argos were to be repatriated, if possible, and those who returned were to be exempt for five years from all service except guard duty on the walls. There were many *territoria vacua* in which they could build houses (Misti, Reg. 44, fol. 119^f): "Cum dominatio nostra toto cordis affectu semper vigilaverit nostris fidelibus subvenire et acciderit civitatem nostram Argos propter Turchorum insultationem non ita bene manere . . . quoniam aliqui nostri fideles . . . sunt reducti in terris Grecorum, [in] duchamine et in castellaniam Corinthii . . . , vadit pars . . . quod sint absoluti ab omni angaria . . . usque quinque annos excepta angaria garde quam facere teneantur cum eorum personis super muro . . ." (summary in Thiriet, *Régestes*, I, no. 967, p. 224).

¹⁸⁴ Arch. di Stato di Venezia, Misti, Reg. 44, fols. 43^v–44^f, 61^v–62^f, 67^v.

¹⁸⁵ Misti, Reg. 44, fols. 42^v, 57^v, and cf. Loenertz, "La Chronique brève moréote de 1423," *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II (1964), 425, and *Chronicon breve*, ad ann. 6907 [Sept. 1398–Aug. 1399] (Bonn, p. 517).

continued to rule as "lords of Athens and Thebes" until the Turks took possession of the lower city of Athens in June, 1456, and of the Acropolis soon thereafter.¹⁰⁶ By this time the medieval history of Greece was giving way to another era, the "Tourkokratia," the period of

Turkish dominance. The Parthenon would be converted into a mosque; a minaret would rise above it while the Frankish Tower continued to loom over the Propylaea—twin symbols of foreign rule in the "violet-crowned" city of Athens, as elsewhere in Greece.

¹⁰⁶ On Athens under the Acciajuoli, see Setton, *Catalan Domination* (1975), pp. 174–215, and *A History of the Crusades*, III (1975), 245–77, with refs. to the sources and to the works of modern historians. Antonio Acciajuoli's title is given in documents published by J. A. C. Buchon, *Nouvelles Recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, 2 vols., Paris, 1845, II, Florence:

docs. LXVIII–LXIX, pp. 289, 290, and cf. doc. LXXI, p. 296, for employment of the Greek title by Nerio II, who appears in Latin texts as *dominus Athenarum et Thebarum* (*ibid.*, docs. LXXII–LXXIII, pp. 298, 299). A Venetian document of 8 July, 1451, also refers to Nerio II, *qui est dominus Stives et Sithines* [i.e. of Thebes and Athens], summarized by N. Iorga, "Notes et extraits," *Revue de l'Orient latin*, VIII (1900–1, repr. 1964), 78.

INDEX

No names of modern scholars (and no references to their works) are included in this index

- Abagha, son of Hulagu; il-khan of Persia 1265–1282: [106](#)
[115–117](#), [120](#), [121](#), [133](#); wife of, *see* Maria (Palaeologina)
- Abarca, Pedro, 17th-century Aragonese annalist, [448](#)
- 'Abbāsids, Arab caliphal dynasty at Baghdad 749–1258: [97](#)
- 'Abd-al-'Aziz II, Abū-Fāris, son of Aḥmad II; Ḥafṣid emir of Bugia (in 1390), ruler of Tunisia 1394–1434: [331](#), [335–337](#)
- Abydos, [104](#)
- Acardi, John, of Mesembria (*fl.* 1366), [304](#)
- Acarmania, [18](#), [25](#), [35](#), [59](#), [90](#), [422](#)
- Acciajuoli, Florentine banking family, [159–162](#), [184](#), [472](#), [473n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Angelo, archbishop of Florence 1342–1355: [184n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Angelo, brother of Nerio I; cardinal (Roman) 1384–1408: [403](#), [464n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Angelo, Latin archbishop of Patras 1365–1367: [297](#), [308](#)
- Acciajuoli, Angelo, son of Niccolò; grand seneschal of Naples 1365–1391: [161](#)
- Acciajuoli, Antonio I, bastard son of Nerio I; lord of Thebes 1394–1435, duke of Athens 1403–1435: [377](#), [472](#), [473n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Antonio II, brother of Nerio II; duke of Athens 1439?–1441: [472](#)
- Acciajuoli, Franco (Francesco II), son of Antonio II; duke of Athens 1455–1456 (d. 1460), [472](#)
- Acciajuoli, Giovanni, brother of Nerio I; Latin archbishop of Patras 1360–1363: [247n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Nerio I, adopted son of (distant cousin) Niccolò; lord of Corinth 1371–1394, duke of Athens (1388) in 1394: [161](#), [162n](#), [247n](#), [451](#), [452](#), [460n](#), [461](#), [464n](#), [466](#), [467](#), [471](#)
- Acciajuoli, Nerio II, great-nephew of Nerio I; duke of Athens 1435–?1439: [472](#), [473n](#)
- Acciajuoli, Niccolò, grand seneschal of Naples 1348–1365: [159–161](#), [236n](#), [242n](#)
- Acerenza, bishop of (B. Prignani), [463n](#)
- Achaea, principality of, [26](#), [28–32](#), [45–47](#), [49](#), [50](#), [56](#), [69](#), [71](#), [73](#), [85](#), [89](#), [90](#), [96](#), [98–100](#), [103](#), [105](#), [112n](#), [120](#), [127](#), [129n](#), [131](#), [143](#), [148–153](#), [156](#), [158](#), [159](#), [161](#), [162](#), [165n](#), [194n](#), [297](#), [342](#), [406](#), [407](#), [416n](#), [421](#), [428](#), [432–437](#), [440](#), [446](#), [449](#), [451n](#), [458n](#), [459](#), [460](#); claimants to, *see* Ferdinand (of Majorca), James II (of Majorca), Marie of Bourbon, Hugh of Lusignan, Amadeo of Savoy, Jacques des Baux, Louis I and II of Anjou, Louis II (of Clermont), Louis of Savoy; princes of, [431](#), and *see* Guillaume of Champlitte 1205–1209, Geoffrey I of Villehardouin (1209) 1210–ca. 1228, Geoffrey II *ca.* 1228–1246, William 1246–1278, Charles I of Anjou 1278–1285, Charles II 1285–1289, Florent of Hainaut 1289–1297, Philip of Savoy 1301–1306 (1307), Philip I of Taranto 1307–1313, Louis of Burgundy 1313–1316, John of Gravina 1322–1333, Robert of Taranto 1333–1364, Philip II of Taranto 1364–1373, Charles III of Durazzo 1383–1386, Ladislav of Naples 1386–1396, Pedro "Bordo" de San Superano 1396–1402, Centurione II Zaccaria 1404–1430, Thomas Palaeologus 1432–1460; princesses of, *see* Isabelle of Villehardouin 1289–1306, Mahaut of Hainaut 1313–1318 (1321), Joanna I of Naples 1373–1381; regents of, *see* Catherine of Valois 1333–1346, Maria Zaccaria 1402–1404; vicars of, *see* Pedro de San Superano 1386–1391, Nerio I Acciajuoli 1391–1394, Angelo Acciajuoli 1394–1405
- Achrida, *see* Ochrida
- Achyraus, [94](#)
- Acre (S. Jean d'Acre, 'Akkā), [69](#), [96n](#), [98](#), [106](#), [108](#), [280](#), [431](#); fall of (1291), [2](#), [99](#), [147](#), [163](#), [167n](#), [169](#), [182](#)
- Acrocorinth, [22](#), [23n](#), [25](#), [34](#), [37](#), [405](#)
- Acropolis (of Athens), [22](#), [23](#), [29](#), [95](#), [377](#), [407](#), [408](#), [417](#), [418](#), [422](#), [445](#), [449](#), [450](#), [452](#), [463](#), [464n](#), [467](#), [468](#), [471–473](#)
- Acropolites, George, Byzantine historian and official (d. 1282), [28](#), [51n](#), [55](#), [60–62](#), [70](#), [71n](#), [72–77](#), [83](#), [84](#), [86](#), [88–91](#), [93](#), [94](#), [114](#), [115](#), [117](#), [124–126](#)
- Adalia (Satalia, Antalya), [60](#), [237n](#), [240–242](#), [246](#), [248](#), [261](#), [262n](#), [282](#), [285](#), [287](#), [288n](#); Gulf of, [249n](#), [266](#), [267](#), [287](#), [385](#)
- Adam, Guillaume, French propagandist (d. *ca.* 1339), [166](#), [174](#)
- Adam of Usk, Welsh chronicler (*fl.* 1400), [373](#)
- Adorno, Antoniotto, doge of Genoa 1384/1396: [330–332](#), [337](#), [340](#)
- Adorno, Gabriele, doge of Genoa 1363–1371: [247](#), [250n](#), [258n](#), [260](#), [282](#), [314](#)
- Adorno, Raffaele, brother of Antoniotto; Genoese commander (in 1388), [330](#)
- Adramereus, Orthodox bishop of, *see* Philagrius
- Adramyttium (Edremit), [18](#), [182](#)
- Adrianople (Edirne), [16–18](#), [20](#), [28](#), [52](#), [53](#), [55](#), [56](#), [72](#), [85](#), [87](#), [131](#), [174](#), [205](#), [245](#), [246n](#), [300](#), [340](#), [356](#), [376](#), [404](#), [407n](#), [416](#); Orthodox bishop of, [310n](#)
- Adriatic Sea, [8](#), [19](#), [44](#), [45](#), [59](#), [81](#), [82](#), [149](#), [180n](#), [228](#), [243](#), [264](#), [290](#), [297](#), [315](#), [317](#), [328](#), [347](#), [357](#), [359](#), [360](#), [379](#), [392](#), [396](#), [404](#), [435n](#)
- Aegean Sea, [78](#), [149](#), [154](#), [160](#), [163](#), [181–183](#), [186](#), [191](#), [197n](#), [198](#), [203](#), [205](#), [218](#), [222](#), [237](#), [245](#), [326](#), [329](#), [357](#), [358n](#), [360](#), [428](#); coast of, [28](#), [35](#), [42](#), [43](#); islands of, [2](#), [18](#), [19n](#), [27](#), [42](#), [68](#), [87](#), [91](#), [143](#), [159](#), [177](#), [182](#), [190](#), [286](#), [289](#), [342](#), [430–432](#), [453](#), [472](#), and *see* Archipelago
- Aegina, [18](#), [23](#), [410n](#), [411n](#), [415n](#), [454](#), [466](#), [471](#); lords of, *see* Boniface of Verona, Alfonso, John, and Pedro Fadrique, Alioto I and Antonello de Caupena
- Aegium, Aigion, *see* Vostitza
- Aeneas Sylvius (Eneo Silvio Piccolomini), *see* Pius II
- Aenos, [394](#); lord of, *see* N. Gatiluisio
- Aetolia, [18](#), [25](#), [35](#), [59](#), [90](#), [422](#)
- Africa, [330](#), and *see* North Africa
- "Agarenes," *see* Turks
- Agathopolis, [18](#)
- Agen, canon of, [263](#)
- Agincourt, battle of (1415), [398](#), [402](#)
- Agnes of Aulnay, wife of Étienne le Maure, lady of Arcadia (in 1322), [157](#)
- Agnes of Courtenay, daughter of Peter and Yolande; wife of Geoffrey II of Villehardouin 1217–1246 (d. 1247), [54](#), [63](#)

- Agnes of Montferrat, daughter of Boniface I; wife of Henry d'Angre 1207-*ca.* 1210: [405](#)
- Agni, Thomas, Latin patriarch of Jerusalem 1272-1277: [110n](#), [115n](#)
- Agram (Zagreb), [347](#)
- Aḥmad, Abū'l-'Abbās. Marinid ruler of Morocco 1373-1384, 1387-1393: [331](#), [335-337](#)
- Aḥmad II, Abū'l-'Abbās, son of Muḥammad; Ḥafṣid ruler of Tunisia 1354-1357, 1360-1394: [330](#), [331](#), [335-337](#), [339](#)
- Aigues-Mortes, [297n](#), [370](#), [374](#)
- Aimon III, son of Amadeo III; count of Geneva in 1367: [294](#), [296n](#), [299](#), [302](#), [306](#)
- Aimon of Geneva-Athon, nephew of Amadeo III (*fl.* 1366), [306](#)
- Aimonet, Amadeo VI's tailor (*fl.* 1366), [296](#), [301](#), [304](#), [305](#)
- Aimoneto, Venetian armorer (*fl.* 1366), [296](#)
- 'Ain Jālūt, battle of (1260), [97](#)
- Aix-en-Provence, [150](#), [232](#), [434](#)
- Aiyūbids, Kurdish dynasty in Egypt (1169) and Syria 1174-1252: [44](#), and *see* Saladin (1169) 1174-1193, al-Kāmil Muḥammad 1218-1238
- Akova (Matagrifon), [91](#), [154](#); lady of, *see* Marguerite of Villehardouin
- Alans, [85n](#)
- Alaya (Scandoloro, Candeloro, Alanya), [385](#), [386](#), [394](#); emirs of, [240](#), [241](#), [386](#)
- Albania, [53](#), [70](#), [72](#), [73](#), [81](#), [109](#), [119](#), [120](#), [127](#), [136](#), [326](#), [328](#), [404](#); "kingdom" of, [104](#), [109](#), [135](#), [136](#), [143](#), [435](#), [460](#); rulers of, *see* Angevins
- Albanians, [43](#), [73](#), [74](#), [109](#), [182](#), [379](#), [451](#), [454](#)
- Albano, cardinal-bishops of, *see* Pelagius, R. Grosparmy, Bonaventura, L. Patrasso, E. Talleyrand, Anglic de Grimoard
- Albert III, brother of Rudolph IV; Hapsburg duke of Austria 1365-1395: [344](#)
- Albert, Latin bishop of Salona 1373-1390: [466](#)
- Albert de Nogerio, Carmelite; Latin bishop of Coronea (from 1346), [462](#), [466n](#)
- Albertino da Canossa, co-lord of Thebes (in 1208), [27n](#), [28](#), [40](#)
- Alberto della Scala, brother of Mastino; co-lord of Verona (d. 1352), [204](#)
- Albertus (Boccerannus), *see* Bocceranni, Alberto
- Albertus Magnus, bishop of Regensburg 1260-1262 (d. 1280, canonized), [113](#)
- Albigensian crusade (1208-1229), [54n](#), [446](#)
- Albin, Guy, Amadeo VI's physician (d. 1367), [296](#), [298](#), [301](#), [304](#), [305](#), [308](#)
- Albrecht II, son of Ludwig IV; duke of Bavaria (-Straubing) 1347-1404: [347](#)
- Alembret of Bohemia, crusader (in 1366), [303](#), [305](#)
- Alençon, count of, *see* Charles
- Alessandria, lord of, *see* F. Cane
- Alessio (Lesh), [404](#)
- Alexander III (Orlando de' Bandinelli), pope 1159-1181: [117](#)
- Alexander IV (Rinaldo de' Conti of Segni), pope 1254-1261: [70](#), [71](#), [77](#), [79](#), [84](#), [90](#), [95](#), [101](#)
- Alexander V (Pietro Filargo), cardinal (Roman) 1405-1409, pope (conciliar) 1409-1410: [397](#)
- Alexander, John, Šišmanid tsar of Bulgaria 1331-1371: [300n](#)
- Alexandretta, Gulf of, [279](#)
- Alexandria (al-Iskandariyah), [151](#), [167](#), [280-283](#), [385](#), [387](#), [388](#), [391-394](#); gates of, [269-271](#); governor of, *see* Ibn 'Arrām; Melkite patriarch of, *see* Niphon; sack of (1365), [2](#), [231](#), [245n](#), [249n](#), [261-278](#), [284-287](#), [308](#), [339n](#), [457](#); trade with, [174](#), [178](#), [197-199](#), [202](#), [210](#), [234](#), [261](#), [262](#), [272](#), [274](#), [276](#), [277n](#), [286](#), [291](#), [329](#), [330](#), [339](#)
- Alexius III Angelus ("Bambacoriatus"), brother of Isaac II; Byzantine emperor 1195-1203: [4](#), [6-10](#), [16](#), [20n](#), [22](#), [42](#), [48](#); wife of, *see* Euphrosyne (Ducaena)
- Alexius IV Angelus, son of Isaac II and Margaret; Byzantine co-emperor 1203-1204: [4](#), [5n](#), [7](#), [8](#), [10-12](#), [16](#), [17](#)
- Alexius I Comnenus, Byzantine emperor 1081-1118: [5](#), [25n](#), [122](#)
- Alexius V Ducas ("Murzuphlus"), son-in-law of Alexius III Angelus; Byzantine emperor in 1204: [12](#), [13n](#), [48n](#); wife of, *see* Eudocia (Angelina)
- Alfonso IV, son of James II; king of Aragon-Catalonia 1327-1336: [167n](#), [444n](#), [465](#)
- Alfonso X ("the Wise" or "the Learned"), king of Castile and León 1252-1284, of Germany (claimant to empire) 1256-1273: [114n](#), [126](#), [128](#)
- Alfonso III, king of Portugal 1248-1279: [123](#)
- Algeria, rulers of, *see* Muwahhids, Ḥafṣids (eastern, 1230-1574), Ziyānids (western, 1236-1556)
- Alghero, [333](#)
- Alioto I de Caupena, lord of Aegina (in 1400), [372](#)
- Allevan "de la Mer," Genoese merchant (*fl.* 1397), [366](#)
- Almohads, *see* Muwahhids
- Alpheus (Charbon), river, [31](#), [127](#), [154](#), [162n](#)
- Alps, [254](#), [291](#)
- Alsace (Elsass), [7](#)
- Altoluogo, *see* Ephesus
- Alyates, Nicephorus, Byzantine official (*fl.* 1259), [84](#)
- Amadeo III, cousin of Amadeo VI of Savoy; count of Geneva 1320-1367: [294](#)
- Amadeo V, count of Savoy 1285-1323: [143](#), [152](#)
- Amadeo VI ("the Green Count"), grandson of Amadeo V; count of Savoy 1343-1383: [232](#), [252-254](#), [258n](#), [275](#), [280n](#), [285-288](#), [291-311](#), [313](#), [315](#), [322](#), [323](#), [325](#), [326](#), [329](#), [332](#), [355](#); wife of, *see* Bonne de Bourbon
- Amadeo VII ("the Red Count"), son of Amadeo VI; count of Savoy 1383-1391: [326](#)
- Amadeo VIII, son of Amadeo VII; count of Savoy 1391-1416, duke 1416-1434, antipope (as Felix V) 1439-1449, cardinal 1449-1451: [396](#), [397](#), [399](#)
- Amadeo of Savoy, grandson of Philip; claimant to Achaea 1368-1402: [162](#)
- Amadi, Francesco, Italian chronicler (d. 1566), [237n](#), [382](#)
- Amalfi, *see* Pisano d'Amalfi
- Amasya, [376](#)
- Ambrosius, Latin bishop of Sozopolis (Sisopolis; d. 1356), [226n](#)
- Amidani, Guglielmo, Augustinian, 14th-century polemicist, [171](#)
- Amiens, [241](#)
- Amorgos, [19n](#)
- Amoyrons, Ioannines, Greek grape-grower (*fl.* 1366), [297](#)
- Amphissa, *see* Salona
- Amposta, castellan of, [230](#)
- Amyclae, *see* Nikli
- Anagni, [4](#), [49](#), [152](#), [163](#), [416](#), [428](#), [437](#)
- Anaplous, [120](#)
- Anatolia (Asia Minor, Rūm), [16](#), [18](#), [52](#), [60](#), [75](#), [85](#), [91](#), [121](#), [122](#), [124n](#), [208](#), [215](#), [220](#), [225n](#), [230](#), [240](#), [241](#), [360](#), [375](#); coasts of, [159](#), [207](#), [236](#), [238](#), [275n](#); Greeks in, [143](#); Mongols in, [61](#), [62](#), [74](#); Turks in, [2](#), [3](#), [33n](#), [97](#), [143](#), [146](#), [149](#), [164n](#), [177](#), [178](#), [181-183](#), [191](#), [224](#),

- 227, 233, 234, 241n, 245, 264, 286, 290, 321, 341, 359, 376, 404, 425, 441, 449n, 451n, 453, 454, 459n, and *see* Turkey
- Anchialus (Axillo, Pomorie), 300, 302, 305, 306n
- Ancona, 125, 151, 188, 197, 204, 315, 319, 455n, 457n; March of, 166, 169, 172, 231; merchants from, 5, 167n; rector of, 210n; ships of, 57, 250n
- Ancyra, *see* Ankara
- Andalusia (al-Andalus), 330; rulers of, *see* Muwahhids, Naṣrids (1232–1492)
- Andravida, 25, 30, 38, 149, 153n, 435, 439
- Andrea da Perugia, Franciscan polemicist (d. 1345), 171
- Andrea de Oltedo, Venetian envoy (in 1366), 293
- Andreas, Cape, 238
- Andrew of Hungary, brother of Louis I; king of Naples 1343–1345: 199, 200, 241; wife of, *see* Joanna I of Naples
- Androin de la Roche, cardinal 1361–1369: 255, 279n
- Andronicus II Palaeologus, son of Michael VIII; Byzantine co-emperor 1272–1282, emperor 1282–1328 (d. 1332), 116, 119, 120, 124–126, 129, 132, 143, 144, 145n, 149, 163–166, 168, 169, 179n, 424, 428, 435n, 437, 439–441; wife of, *see* Yolanda of Montferrat
- Andronicus III Palaeologus, son of Michael IX; Byzantine co-emperor 1316–1328, emperor 1328–1341: 179–181, 183, 189, 213, 287n; wife of, *see* Anna of Savoy
- Andronicus IV Palaeologus, son of John V and Helena; Byzantine co-emperor 1355–1376, emperor 1376–1379 (d. 1385), 300, 309, 310n, 316, 319, 321, 322, 325; wife of, *see* Maria (Kyratsa)
- Andronicus Palaeologus Asen, grandson of Michael VIII; Byzantine governor at Mistra 1316–ca. 1323 (d. after 1355), 154n
- Andros, 9, 18, 408, 410n, 428–432, 462, 463n; bishops of, *see* Nicholas, John, John de S. Catarina; lords of, *see* M. Dandolo, Geremia Ghisi, Andrea Ghisi, P. Zeno, F. Crispo
- Angeli, Byzantine imperial dynasty at Constantinople 1185–1204: 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 21, 25n, and *see* Isaac II 1185–1195, Alexius III 1195–1203, Isaac II and Alexius IV 1203–1204; *see also* Eudocia and Irene (Angelina), Ducae of Epirus, Thessalonica, and Neopatras
- Angelina, wife of Pedro de Pou (d. 1362), 456
- Angelo, patriarch of Grado 1255–1271: 79
- Angelo d'Orvieto, Franciscan (fl. 1278), 129–132
- Angelocastro, 435
- Angevins, French dynasty in Naples 1266–1442: 2, 19n, 62n, 81n, 102n, 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 116n, 119, 120, 124, 125, 127, 128, 132, 137, 138, 140–154, 158–162, 164, 170, 179, 181, 188, 196, 319n, 424, 432, 433, 435, 436, 438, 440, 441, 446, 448, 449, and *see* Charles I of Anjou 1266–1285, Charles II 1285–1309, Robert 1309–1343, Joanna I 1343–1381, Charles III 1381–1386, Ladislav 1386–1414; *see also* Beatrice (2), Charles Martel, Maria, and Philip of Anjou; in Albania and Epirus, *see* Charles I and II, Philip I of Taranto 1315–1331, Robert of Taranto 1331–1333, John of Gravina 1333–1335, Charles of Durazzo 1335–1348, Joanna 1348–1368, Charles III 1368–1386; in Achaea 1278–1396, *see* Charles I 1278–1285, Charles II 1285–1289, Philip I of Taranto 1307–1313, John of Gravina 1322–1333, Robert of Taranto 1333–1364, Philip II of Taranto 1364–1373, Joanna I 1373–1381, Charles III 1383–1386, Ladislav 1386–1396; in the Latin empire (titular), *see* Philip I 1313–1331, Robert of Taranto 1346–1364, Philip II 1364–1373; in Hungary, *see* Louis I 1342–1382 (also Poland 1370–1382), Andrew, Stephen
- Anglic de Grimoard, brother of Urban V; bishop of Avignon 1362–1366, cardinal 1366–1388: 255, 262, 279
- Ania (Anaea), 428n, and *see* Bulgarinus de Ania
- Anjou, count of, *see* Charles of Valois; duke of, *see* Louis I; house of, *see* Angevins
- Ankara (Ancyra), battle of (1402), 326, 329, 355n, 374n, 376, 379, 382, 400; Orthodox metropolitan of, *see* Macarius
- Anna ("Palaeologina"), daughter of Eulogia (and John Cantacuzenus); wife of Nicephorus I Ducas 1265–1296, despoina of Epirus (after 1296), 422, 435, 438–441
- Anna, daughter of Bela IV of Hungary; wife of Rostislav Mikhailovich (fl. 1256), 73
- Anna (Agnes), daughter of Michael II Ducas and Theodora; wife of William of Villehardouin 1258–1278, wife of Nicholas II of S. Omer 1280–ca. 1284: 82, 83n, 99, 104, 127
- Anna (Jeanne or Joanna) of Savoy, daughter of Amadeo V; wife of Andronicus III 1326–1341, regent (as empress-dowager) 1341–1347 (d. ca. 1365), 189, 205, 206, 212, 229n, 287n, 301n, 318
- Anseau of Toucy, Frankish lord (fl. 1259), 89–91
- Antelme d'Urtières, crusader (in 1366), 301, 302, 305
- Antelmus, Latin archbishop of Patras 1205–1232: 26n, 38, 47, 408n, 410n, 411n, 414
- Antioch, bishop of, *see* Peter III; Melkite patriarch of, *see* Pachomeus I; titular Latin patriarch of, *see* L. Tacconi
- Antioch, principality of, 97; princes of, *see* Bohemond I 1099–1111, John of Lusignan (titular)
- Antipopes, *see* P. Rainallucci da Corbara ("Nicholas V" 1328–1330), Clement VII (Avignon 1378–1394), Benedict XIII (Avignon 1394–1423), Alexander V (conciliar 1409–1410), Amadeo VIII ("Felix V", conciliar 1439–1449)
- Antivari (Bar), 396, 404
- Antoine "the elder," bastard son of Amadeo VI (d. ca. 1366), 303n
- Antoine "the younger," bastard son of Amadeo VI (fl. 1366), 305, 307
- Antonello de Caupena, bastard grandson of Alioto I; lord of Aegina 1440–1451: 471
- Antonio (de Rivello), bishop of Melfi 1363–1366: 246n
- Antonio, Latin bishop of Coronea (d. 1346), 462, 466n
- Antonio de'Aribandi, bishop of Gaeta 1341–1348: 203
- Antonio de Casagemmes, Augustinian (fl. 1403), 464n
- Antonio della Roca, Genoese merchant (fl. 1397), 366
- Antonius IV, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1389–1390, 1391–1397: 471
- Aosta, bishop of (Aimery 1361–1375), 286n
- Apocaucus, John, Orthodox archbishop of Naupactus (Lepanto, in 1218), 45, 52
- Aprus, 19
- Apulia (Puglia), 3, 55, 95, 130, 151, 179, 432; duke of, 127; "kingdom" of, 137
- Aquileia, 248, 258, 322; patriarchs of, 192n, and *see* Nicholas of Luxemburg, L. Torriani, Marquardt de Randeck
- Aquinas, Thomas, Dominican theologian (d. 1274, canonized), 112
- Aragon, 96n, 149; mercenaries from, 441, 442, 446–448; soldiers from, 143
- Aragon-Catalonia, 144, 146, 195, 246, 332, 374, 433, 443, 444, 454, 455n; Crown of, 163, 175, 455, 460, 466, 468,

- 469; house of, [140](#), [148](#), [164](#); kings of, *see* James I 1213–1276, Pedro III 1276–1285, James II 1291–1327, Alfonso IV 1327–1336, Pedro IV 1336–1387, John I 1387–1395, Martin I 1395–1410; *see also* Simona of Aragon
- Arbe (Rab), [404](#)
- Arcadia (Kyparissia), [25](#), [31](#); Gulf of, [31](#); lady of, *see* Agnes of Aulnay; lords of, *see* Érard III le Maure, Centurione II Zaccaria
- Arcadia (Mesarea), district of, [24](#), [31](#), [154](#)
- Archeto di Val d'Aosta, crusader (in 1366), [305](#)
- Archipelago, [66](#), [86](#), [131](#), [197](#), 424n, [426](#), 433n, [449](#), 454n, *and see* Aegean Sea, islands of; duchy of, *see* Naxos
- Arezzo, [121](#), [123](#), 308n, *and see* Grifon of Arezzo
- Argenti, Battista, merchant at Pera (*fl.* 1397), [366](#)
- Arghun, son of Abagha; il-khan of Persia 1284–1291: [146](#), [147](#)
- Argironion (Giront, Umuryeri), [301](#)
- Argolid, 28n, [34](#), [49](#), [127](#), 159n, [448](#), [450](#)
- Argos, 20n, [22](#), [23](#), [25](#), [36–38](#), [48](#), [49](#), [68](#), [79](#), 99n, [150](#), [204](#), [326](#), [405](#), [421](#), [427](#), [432–434](#), [440](#), [448](#), [452](#), [472](#); Latin bishops of, 420n, *and see* James (Petri); lords of, *see* Gautier de Foucherolles, Guy d'Enghien
- Arlay, lord of, *see* Hugh of Chalon
- Arles, [121](#), [218](#), *and see* Caesarius of Arles
- Armagnac, counts of, [195](#), *and see* Jean II
- Armenia, Cilician (or Lesser), kingdom of, [97](#), [103](#), [191](#), [203](#), [204](#), [238](#), [248](#), [282](#), 342n, [446](#); kings of, [167](#), [266](#), [281](#), *and see* Leon III (Hetoumid) 1269–1289; queen of, *see* Margaret of Soissons (Maria)
- Armenians, in Greece, [445](#)
- Arnaud de Cervole, Gascon routier (d. 1366), [232](#), [293](#)
- Arnestus de Pardubiz, archbishop of Prague 1343–1364: 229n
- Arno, river, [199](#), [323](#)
- Aroldo da Milano, Italian at Negroponte (by 1262), 80n, 81n
- Arqua, Polio, Genoese envoy (in 1403), [388](#)
- Arras, [360](#), [366](#), [403](#)
- Arsenal (in Venice), 185n, 276n, [281](#), [287](#), [295](#), [319](#), [347](#), [392](#), [393](#)
- Arsenius (of Apollonia), Orthodox patriarch at Nicaea 1255–1259, at Constantinople 1261–1265 (d. 1273), [76](#), [77](#), [94](#), 102n
- Arsof, [108](#)
- Arta, [25](#), [43](#), [59](#), [75](#), [86](#), [89](#), [90](#), [130](#), [424](#), [435](#), [452](#); Gulf of, [90](#), [435](#)
- Artemisium, [426](#)
- Artois, [368](#), *and see* Philippe d'Artois; count of, *see* Robert III
- Asanes, Constantine, Byzantine (*fl.* 1370), [319](#)
- Asenids, Vlach royal dynasty in Bulgaria 1187–1257: [52](#), *and see* Ioannitsa (Kaloyan) 1197–1207, John Asen II 1218–1241, Koloman I 1241–1246, Michael Asen 1246–1257, Koloman II in 1257; *see also* Andronicus Palaeologus Asen, Helena *and* Maria (Asenina), D. Strez
- al-Ashraf Khalil, Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn, son of Kalavun; Bahārī Mamluk sultan of Egypt and Syria 1290–1293: [163](#)
- Asia Minor, *see* Anatolia
- Assisi, 452n
- Assizes of Romania, [31–33](#), [98](#), [99](#), [154](#), [155](#), [432](#)
- Asti, [152](#), *and see* Henry d'Asti
- Astypalaea (Stamalia), 19n, [385](#)
- Athanasius I, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1289–1293, 1303–1309: 164n
- Athens, [19](#), 20n, [22](#), [23](#), 24n, [29](#), 37n, [42](#), [46](#), [49](#), 65–67, [70](#), 87n, [95](#), 129n, [150](#), 156n, [206](#), [233](#), [258](#), [298](#), 371n, [405–409](#), [412](#), [414–418](#), [420](#), [425](#), [432](#), [433](#), [437](#), [440](#), [441](#), [443–446](#), [448](#), [450](#), [452](#), [461–464](#), [466–468](#), 469n, [471–473](#); Articles of, [467](#); bishop of, *see* Dionysius the Areopagite; captain and castellan of, *see* Galcerán de Peralta; Latin archbishops of, 46n, [47](#), 50n, [64](#), [149](#), [150](#), [415](#), [416](#), [419](#), [428](#), [429](#), [464](#), *and see* Bérard, Conrad, Stephen, Henry, N. Salamon, John, Nicholas de Raynaldo, Francis, John, A. Ballester, A. Blasi (titular), G. Boem (titular); Orthodox metropolitans of, 22n, [408](#), 409n, 410n, [462](#), *and see* M. Choniates, Dorotheus, Macarius
- Athens, lordship and duchy of, under Burgundians (1205–1311), [28](#), [29](#), [49](#), [56](#), [65](#), [77](#), [83](#), [131](#), 145n, [150](#), [151](#); under Catalans (1311–1388), [153](#), 156n, [159](#), [162](#), 177n, 181n, [189](#), [298](#), [328](#), [342](#), [405–473](#); under Florentines (1388–1456), [161](#); duchesses of, *see* Helena (Ducaena), regent 1287–1296, Maria (of Sicily) 1377–ca. 1380, Jeanne de Châtillon; dukes of, [31](#), *and see* William (I) de la Roche 1280–1287, Guy II de la Roche 1287–1308, Gautier I (V) de Brienne 1309–1311, Manfred 1312–1317, William (II) of Randazzo 1317–1338, Frederick II (III of Sicily) 1355–1377, Peter (Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia) 1380–1387, John III (I of Aragon-Catalonia) 1387–1388, Nerio I Acciajuoli (1388) in 1394, Antonio I 1403–1435, Nerio II 1435–ca. 1439, 1441–1451, Antonio II ca. 1439–1441, Franco 1455–1456; great lords of, *see* Othon de la Roche 1205–1225, Guy I 1225–1263, John I 1263–1280; titular dukes of, *see* Gautier II (VI) de Brienne 1311–1356, Louis d'Enghien 1381–d. by 1390, Martin I (of Sicily) 1391–1402; vicars-general of, *see* Alfonso Fadrique 1317–ca. 1330, Odo de Novelles ca. 1330–1331, N. Lancia 1331–ca. 1335, James Fadrique 1356–1359?, Matteo de Moncada 1359–1361, 1363–1366, Pedro de Pou 1361–1362, Roger de Lloria 1366–ca. 1370, Luis Fadrique 1375–1381, P. Dalmau (1379) 1381–1382 (1386), Pedro de Pau 1387–1388
- Athos, Mount, monks of, [320](#), [441](#)
- Attica, [21](#), [23](#), [33](#), [39](#), [49](#), 56n, [89](#), [406](#), [411](#), [413](#), [416](#), [418–420](#), [427](#), [432](#), [442](#), [448](#), [452](#), [454](#), [472](#)
- Aubert, Étienne, *see* Innocent VI
- Augsburg, bishop of, *see* Marquardt de Randeck
- Augustinians, order, [193](#), [197](#), *and see* G. Amidani, Antonio de Casagemmes, John de Royis, Nicholas (of Andros), Nicole de Brohom, Rudolph of Città di Castello
- Aulon (Avlonari), [408](#), [409](#), [415](#), [462](#)
- Austria (Ostmark), 249n, [258](#), [322](#), [343](#), [366](#), *and see* John of Austria; dukes of, *see* Hapsburgs (1282–1780)
- Autremencourt, *see* Thomas I, II, and III d'Autremencourt
- Auvergne, [211](#), [213](#), [215](#)
- Auxerre, [44](#)
- Aversa, [153](#), [199](#)
- Avignon, [2](#), [139](#), [153](#), [154](#), [159](#), 160n, 161n, [163](#), [169](#), [172](#), [174–177](#), 178n, 180n, [181](#), [184–189](#), [193–200](#), [205](#), [208](#), [210–221](#), [223–226](#), [228–233](#), 236n, [238](#), [240](#), [242–250](#), [259–263](#), [272–274](#), [276](#), 280n, [285](#), [286](#), [288](#), [291](#), [294](#), 299n, [313](#), [327](#), [328](#), [333](#), [340](#), [345](#), [370](#), [372](#), [375](#), [397](#), [442](#), [446](#), [448](#), [450](#), [452–459](#), [461](#), [462](#), [465](#), [469](#), [470](#); antipopes at (1378–1417), *see* Antipopes; bishop of, *see* Anglic de Grimoard
- Avlona (Valona), [81](#), [86](#), 119n, [122](#), [136](#), [137](#), [404](#)
- Ayas (Ajazzo or Lajazzo), [279](#), [282](#)
- Aydin (Lydia), [212](#), [218](#), [219](#), [341](#), [376](#); emirs of, *see* Mehmed, Umur (Pasha), Khidr (Beg)
- Ayglier, Bernard, *see* Bernard I Ayglier
- Aymar de Clermont, lord of Hauterive (*fl.* 1366), [293](#), [299](#), [302](#)
- Aymar de Lavont, bishop of Limassol 1367–1374; 265n

- Aynard, Lancelme, knight (*fl.* 1347), [208](#)
 Azov, Sea of, [382](#)
- Babylon, *see* Egypt
 Baden, margrave of, *see* Frederick
 Baghdad, [97](#), [98n](#); caliphs at, *see* 'Abbāsids
 Baibars, Bahri Mamluk sultan of Egypt and Syria 1260–1277: [97](#), [106](#), [108](#), [120n](#), [122](#)
 Balaton, Lake, [347](#)
 Balduino, Lambertino, bishop of Limassol 1337–1344: [183n](#)
 Baldwin I, count (IX) of Flanders 1194–1205 and (VI) of Hainaut 1195–1205, Latin emperor of Constantinople 1204–1205: [9](#), [13](#)–[18](#), [20](#), [22n](#), [28n](#), [50n](#), [143](#), [148](#), [405](#)
 Baldwin II, of Courtenay, son of Peter and Yolande; Latin emperor of Constantinople 1228–1231, co-emperor 1231–1257, emperor 1237 (crowned 1240)–1261, titular 1261–1273: [45](#), [54](#)–[56](#), [60](#), [61n](#), [63](#)–[68](#), [70](#), [71](#), [78](#), [82](#), [83](#), [91](#)–[96](#), [98](#), [99](#), [103](#)–[105](#), [112](#), [153](#), [164n](#); wife of, *see* Maria (of Brienne)
 Balearic islands, [333](#)
 Balkan (or Savoyard) crusade (1366–1367), [232](#), [275](#), [285](#)–[301](#), [307](#), [309](#), [311](#), [322](#), [355](#)
 Balkans, [2](#), [3](#), [45](#), [60](#), [111](#), [133](#), [225](#), [226](#), [286](#), [291](#), [320](#), [329](#), [341](#), [342n](#), [364](#); mountains, [55](#), [72](#)
 Ballester, Antonio, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Athens 1370–?1387: [463](#), [464](#), [466](#), [468](#)
 Ballufier, Bartholomé, captive lord on the Savoyard crusade (in 1366), [303](#)
 Bapheus, Ottoman victory at, [2n](#), [166n](#)
 Bar (now Bar-le-Duc), count of, *see* Theobald I; duke of, *see* Robert; *see also* Henri and Philippe de Bar
 Bar Hebraeus, Gregory Abū'l-Farāj, Jacobite patriarch at Aleppo 1252–1286: [94n](#), [147n](#)
 Barbary coast, [280](#), [333](#); corsairs, [330](#), [331](#); crusade, *see* Tunisia, crusade of 1390
 Barbier, Antoine, Amadeo VI's accountant, 286n, 292n, [293](#), [296](#), [299](#), [301](#)–[308](#)
 Barbo, Pantaleone, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1379–1381: [325](#)
 Barbo, Pietro, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1216–?1218: [36](#)
 Barcelona, [138](#), [167n](#), [330](#), [373](#), [446](#), [465](#), [469](#); archives of, [175](#); bishops of, *see* Pons de Gualba, Ferrer d'Abella
 Barcelona, county of, [443](#); counts of, *see* Aragon-Catalonia, kings of; Customs of [443](#), [444](#); house of, [143](#), [146](#), [445](#), [460](#)
 Bardanes, George ("Atticus"), Orthodox metropolitan of Corfu (from 1219), [52](#), [58](#), [59n](#), [418](#)
 Bari, 109n, [130](#), [148n](#); bishop of, [463n](#); Council of (1098), [117](#)
 Barkuk, Burjī Mamluk sultan of Egypt and Syria 1382–1389, 1390–1399: [345](#), [347](#), [348n](#), [356](#)
 Barlaam, Basilian; bishop of Gerace 1342–1347: [160n](#), [189](#)
 Barletta, 131n, 136n, [150](#)
 Barnaba da Parma, captain of Smyrna (in 1348), [216](#)
 Barozzi, Venetian Templar (*fl.* 1204), [13](#)
 Barozzi, Andrea, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1258–1259: [80](#)
 Bartholomew, Latin archbishop of Corinth (in 1312), [447](#), [452](#)
 Bartholomew of Rome, papal emissary (in 1347), [212](#), [213](#), [215](#)
 Bartoli, Giovanni, Sienese goldsmith (*fl.* 1365), [286](#)
 Bartolommeo, bishop of Brindisi 1306–1319: [165](#)
 Bartolommeo d'Amelia, bishop of Grosseto 1278–1291: [129](#)–[132](#)
 Bartolommeo da Siena, Franciscan (*fl.* 1278), [129](#)–[132](#)
 Bartolommeo de' Papazzurri, Latin archbishop of Patras 1363–1365: [255](#), [256](#), [458](#)
 Bartolommeo de' Tomari, papal envoy (*fl.* 1346), [205](#), [206](#), [208](#), [209](#), [212n](#), [213](#), [214](#), [216](#), [217](#), [219](#)
 Basil II, Byzantine co-emperor 963–976, emperor 976–1025: [29](#)
 Basilians, order, [58](#), and *see* Barlaam
 Bassadona, Nicoletto, Venetian (*fl.* 1362), [457](#)
 Bassano, [396](#)
 Basset, sire de, crusader (in 1366), [296](#), [299](#), [302](#)
 Bastiani, Lazzaro, Venetian artist (*fl.* 1480), [284](#)
 Batu (Khan), ruler of the Golden Horde 1243–1256: [61](#)
 Bavaria, court of, [194](#), [195](#); crusaders from, [351](#); dukes of, [247](#), and *see* Ludwig IV, Albrecht II
 Bayazid I (Yıldırım or İldirim, "the Thunderbolt"), son of Murad I; Ottoman sultan 1389–1402 (d. 1403), [326](#), [330n](#), [341](#), [344](#)–[348](#), [350](#)–[355](#), [356n](#), [358](#)–[365](#), [367](#), [368](#), [370](#), [373](#), [375](#), [376](#), [379](#), [471](#), [472n](#); daughter of, [357](#)
 Bayazid II, son of Mehmed II; Ottoman sultan 1481–1512: [2n](#)
 Bayonne, bishop of, *see* Garsias de Henguy
 Beatrice (da Verona), daughter of Giberto II; triarch of Euboea 1279–1328, wife of Jean de Noyer de Maisy *ca.* 1303–1326: [450](#)
 Beatrice (of Provence), wife of Charles I of Anjou 1246–1267: [104](#)
 Beatrice of Anjou, daughter of Charles I and Beatrice; wife of Philip of Courtenay 1273–1275: [105](#), [164n](#)
 Beatrice of Anjou, daughter of Charles II; wife of Bertrand des Baux 1309–1321: [201n](#)
 Beatrice of Luxemburg, daughter of Henry VII (d. 1319), [170](#)
 Beaucaire, [121](#), [193](#)
 Beauchamp, Thomas, earl of Warwick 1315–1369: [253](#), [258n](#)
 Beaufort, *see* G. Roger of Beaufort; *see also* Gregory XI (Pierre Roger of Beaufort); viscount of, *see* G. Roger Beaufort (Levtro), [68](#)
 Beaujeu, *see* William of Beaujeu; lord of, *see* Edward
 Beauvais, *see* Vincent of Beauvais; bishop of, *see* Jean de Marigny
 Beauvoir (Pontikocastro), [25](#), [148n](#)
 Beirut (Bairūt), 262n, 277n, [282](#), [329](#), [330](#), [387](#)–[391](#), [393](#)–[396](#); titular lord of, *see* Jean de Lusignan
 Bela IV, nephew of Emeric I; Árpád king of Hungary 1235–1270: [73](#), [97n](#), [106](#)
 Bela of S. Omer, son of Nicholas I and Margaret; lord of half Thebes (by 1240, d. 1258?), [417](#), [418n](#); wife of, *see* Bonne de la Roche
 Bellevaux abbey, [408](#), [413](#), [418](#)
 Belley, bishop of (Guillaume de Martel 1356–1371), 286n
 Bellini, Gentile, Venetian artist (d. 1507), [284](#)
 Belluno, [396](#); bishop of, *see* J. Zeno
 Bembo, Andrea, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1393–1395: [471](#)
 Bembo, Francesco, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1401–1402, 1405–1408: [472](#)
 Bembo, Francesco, Venetian envoy to Cairo (in 1366), [274](#), [276](#)
 Benedetti, Francesco, Giovanni, and Pace, brothers of Niccolò (*fl.* 1359), [235](#)
 Benedetti, Niccolò, Hospitaller; captain of Smyrna 1359–1363: [234](#)–[236](#)
 Benedict, cardinal 1200–1216: [29n](#), [40](#), [407](#)
 Benedict XI (Niccolò Boccasini), cardinal 1298–1303, pope 1303–1304: [163](#), [164](#), [167n](#)

- Benedict XII (Jacques Fournier), cardinal 1327–1334, pope 1334–1342: [159](#), [172](#), [176](#), [179](#), [183](#), [184](#), [186](#), [187](#), [196](#), [224](#), [226n](#), [230](#), [453](#), [455](#)
- Benedict XIII (Pedro Martínez de Luna), cardinal 1375–1394, pope at Avignon 1394–1423: [212n](#), [345](#), [370](#), [372](#), [375](#), [396](#), [397](#), [464](#)
- Benedictines, order, [176](#), [223](#), [297](#), and see E. Cambarou, Urban V
- Benevento, [169](#); battle of (1266), [102](#)
- Benjamin of Tudela, Jewish traveler and author (ca. 1160), [9n](#)
- Bérard, Latin archbishop of Athens (from 1206), [40](#), [407–412](#), [462](#), [463n](#)
- Bérard of Naples, papal notary (*fl.* 1276), [116n](#), [117n](#), [123n](#), [125n](#)
- Berat, [81](#), [86](#), [136–138](#)
- Berbers, [330](#), [335](#), [339](#)
- Berenguer de Puigverde, Catalan (*fl.* 1346), [454](#)
- Bergamo, see Bonagratia and Venturino da Bergamo
- Berke (Bärkä), brother of Batu; ruler of the Golden Horde 1257–1266: [97](#), [98](#)
- Berlion de Foras, crusader (in 1366), [302](#)
- Bernabò di S. Stefano, Genoese at Pera (*fl.* 1366), [301](#), [306](#)
- Bernard, Latin archbishop of Naxos and Paros 1330–1345: [186](#)
- Bernard I Ayglier (Ayglerio), abbot of Monte Cassino 1263–1282: [112n](#), [119](#), [120](#)
- Bernardi, William, Angevin marshal (in 1272), [109](#)
- Berne, MS. at, [155](#)
- Berrhoea, [45](#), [69](#), [74](#), [75](#), [77](#), [85](#), [87](#); Orthodox bishop of (in 1213), [30](#)
- Berry, duke of, see John
- Berthold I, count of Katzenellenbogen 1173?–?1217, lord of Velestino 1205–?1217: [27n](#), [28](#), [40](#)
- Bertraud de Déaux, archbishop of Embrun 1332–1338, cardinal 1338–1355: [181n](#), [183](#), [184n](#), [470](#)
- Bertrand des Baux, Angevin bailie of Achaia 1336–1338, 1341–1344 (d. 1347), [193](#), [194n](#), [201n](#)
- Bertrand des Baux, count of Montescaglioso (*fl.* 1309), [194n](#), [200](#), [201n](#); wife of, see Beatrice of Anjou
- Bertrand du Poujet, cardinal 1316–1352: [137n](#), [172](#), [173](#), [469](#)
- Bertranet Mota de Salahia, Gascon lord of Livadia (in 1399), [372](#)
- Besançon, [366](#), [405](#)
- Bessarion (of Trebizond), cardinal 1439–1472, titular patriarch of Constantinople 1463–1472: [471](#)
- Bevazano, Francesco, Venetian notary (*fl.* 1406), [396n](#), [399](#)
- Biandrate, see John of Biandrate; counts of, see Oberto, B. Sangiorgio
- Biblia, Gabriel, crusader (in 1366), [303](#)
- Bithynia, [2](#), [73](#), [93n](#), [166n](#)
- Bitonto, bishop of, see L. Corasio
- Blachernae, palace (at Constantinople), [12](#), [16](#), [93](#), [94](#), [132](#), [137](#), [144](#), [168](#), [310n](#)
- Black Death (plague, 1348–1350), [173](#), [176](#), [218](#), [241](#), [472](#)
- Black Sea, [18](#), [92](#), [258](#), [288](#), [300–305](#), [330](#), [356](#), [371](#); ports of, [163](#), [179](#), [377](#)
- Blackheath, [373](#)
- Blanche of Castile, wife of Louis VIII 1200–1226, regent of France 1226–1236, 1248–1252: [50](#), [51](#), [65](#), [66](#)
- Blanche of Geneva, daughter of Amadeo III; wife of Hugh of Chalon (from 1363), [294n](#)
- Blanche of Savoy, sister of Amadeo VI; wife of Galeazzo II Visconti 1350–1378 (d. 1387), [291–293](#)
- Blasi (Dexart?), Antonio, Mercedarian; titular (Avignonese) Latin archbishop of Athens 1388–1403, archbishop of Cagliari 1403–1414: [464n](#)
- Blemmydes, Nicephorus, Byzantine scholar (*fl.* 1258), [72](#), [76](#), [94](#)
- Blois, count of, see Louis I
- Boccaccio, Giovanni, Italian author (d. 1375), [160n](#), [422](#)
- Bocceranni, Alberto, lord of Liconia (in 1235), [82n](#), [418](#); nieces of (Floretta and Vermilia), [418](#)
- Boem, Gerard, Franciscan; titular Latin archbishop of Athens (from 1388, Roman), [464n](#)
- Boeotia, [19n](#), [23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [33](#), [39](#), [49](#), [56n](#), [89](#), [406](#), [411–414](#), [416](#), [418](#), [420](#), [427](#), [432](#), [442](#), [452](#), [462](#), [466](#)
- Bogomiles, sect, [290n](#)
- Bohemia, [173](#), [249n](#), [346](#), and see Alebret of Bohemia; kingdom of, [73n](#), [294](#), [297](#); kings of, [173](#), and see Ottokar II 1253–1278, John of Luxemburg 1310–1346, Charles IV 1346–1378, Sigismund 1419–1437; see also John of Bohemia
- Bohemond I, prince of Antioch 1099–1111: [1](#)
- Bologna, [133n](#), [188](#), [197](#), [199](#), [200n](#), [204](#), [210n](#), [243](#), [247](#), [252](#), [260](#), [279](#), [308n](#), [364n](#), [429n](#); lords of, see Pepoli
- Bolonchini, Sylvester, Cypriote envoy (in 1362), [242](#)
- Bolu, [360](#)
- Bon, Bartolommeo, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), [294n](#)
- Bon, Dardi (“Dardibon”), Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), [294n](#), [302](#)
- Bon, Nicoletto, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1367), [295n](#)
- Bona (Hippo), [331](#), [339](#)
- Bonaccolsi, Passerino (Rinaldo), lord of Mantua 1309–1328: [172](#)
- Bonagratia of Bergamo, Franciscan polemicist (d. 1347), [172](#)
- Bonaventura (Fidanza), Franciscan; cardinal 1273–1274 (canonized), [111n](#), [113](#), [114](#), [118](#)
- Bongiovanni, bishop of Fermo 1349–1363: [227n](#)
- Boniface I, son of Guglielmo III; marquis of Montferrat 1192–1207, lord of Thessalonica 1204–1207: [5n](#), [7–9](#), [13](#), [15–18](#), [21–24](#), [27](#), [28n](#), [29](#), [36](#), [40](#), [50n](#), [177](#), [405–407](#), [418](#); wife of, see Margaret (of Hungary)
- Boniface II, son of Guglielmo IV; marquis of Montferrat 1225–1253, titular king of Thessalonica 1230–1253: [53n](#)
- Boniface VIII (Benedetto Caetani), cardinal 1281–1294, pope 1294–1303: [123](#), [149–152](#), [163](#), [168n](#), [437](#), [446](#)
- Boniface IX (Perino Tomacelli), cardinal 1381–1389, pope 1389–1404: [173n](#), [333](#), [340](#), [342](#), [343](#), [358](#), [359n](#), [370](#), [379n](#)
- Boniface of Verona, son of Francesco; triarch of Euboea 1294–1317, bailie of Athens 1308–1309: [424](#), [434](#), [439](#), [450](#)
- Bonne de Bourbon, daughter of Pierre I; wife of Amadeo VI of Savoy 1355–1383 (d. 1403), [286](#), [292](#), [296](#), [299](#), [300](#), [326](#)
- Bonne de la Roche, sister of Guy I; wife of Bela of S. Omer (*fl.* 1240), lady of half Thebes, [417](#)
- Bonzan, Raymond, Marseillais skipper (d. 1366), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Bordeaux, [146](#), [147n](#), [148n](#), [166](#), [231](#), [344](#); archbishop of, [163](#), and see Philippe de Chambarlhac
- Bordelais, [293](#)
- Borilla Longos, [88](#)
- Bosnia, [73n](#), [342](#); people of, [61](#), [367](#); ruler of, see Tvrtko I
- Bosporus, [2](#), [52](#), [67](#), [83](#), [98](#), [105](#), [111](#), [165](#), [166](#), [214](#), [228](#), [229](#), [239n](#), [288](#), [301](#), [312](#), [318](#), [322](#), [330](#), [346](#), [347](#), [356](#), [359](#), [367](#), [371](#), [379](#), [380](#), [384](#); city on, see Constantinople; empire on, see Byzantine empire, Latin empire

- Botron (al-Batrūn), [282](#), [387](#)
- Boucicaud, Jean II (le Meingre), governor of Genoa 1401–1409, marshal of France (d. 1421), [340](#), [341](#), [344](#), [345](#), [348–351](#), [353–356](#), [360–364](#), [366](#), [370–372](#), [378](#), [379n](#), [382–398](#), [400](#), [402n](#); biographer of (H. Durand?), [344](#), [348–351](#), [353–356](#), [362](#), [363](#), [371](#), [384](#), [387](#), [389](#), [391](#), [394](#)
- Boudonitza (Mendenitsa), [28](#), [45](#), [67](#), [69](#), [409n](#), [416](#), [417n](#); bishops of, *see* Thermopylae; marchioness of, *see* Guglielma Pallavicini; marquis (margraves) of, [31](#), and *see* Guido, Ubertino, and Thomas Pallavicini, Niccolò I Giorgio; margraviate of, [29](#), [68](#), [181](#), [424](#), [454](#)
- Boukoleon, palace (at Constantinople), [12](#), [45](#)
- Bourbon (-l'Archambault), dukes of, *see* Louis I, Pierre I, and Louis II (of Clermont); *see also* Bonne, Jacques, and Marie de Bourbon
- Bourbonnais, [293](#)
- Bourges, archbishop of, *see* Roger le Fort
- Bourtzes, George, Orthodox metropolitan of Athens (d. 1160), [22n](#)
- Boyl, John, titular Latin bishop of Megara (in 1380), [466–471](#)
- Brabant, duchess of, *see* Jeanne; dukes of, [10n](#), [128](#), [179](#), and *see* Henry I of Louvain, John III; estates of, [368](#)
- Bragadin, Jacopo, Venetian envoy (in 1369), [264](#), [311](#), [312](#), [313n](#), [314](#), [317](#)
- Branas, Theodore, Byzantine ruler of Adrianople (after 1206), [407n](#)
- Brancaccio, Landolfo, cardinal 1294–1312: [150](#)
- Brandenburg, margraves of, [173](#)
- Brazza (Brač), [404](#)
- Breisgau, [347](#)
- Brétigny, [232](#)
- Brienne (-la-Vieille), family, [206](#), [446](#), [450](#), [452](#), [456n](#), [460](#); counts of, *see* Hugh 1250–1296, Gautier V 1296–1311, Gautier VI 1311–1356; *see also* Isabella, Isabelle, John, and Maria de Brienne
- Brindisi, [44](#), [50](#), [51](#), [58](#), [111](#), [122](#), [129n](#), [130](#), [135](#), [136](#), [138](#), [148](#), [165](#), [198](#), [404](#), [414n](#), [421](#), [436](#), [438](#), [452](#), and *see* Margaritone of Brindisi; bishop of, *see* Bartolommeo
- Brissi, [19](#)
- Brittany (Bretagne), count of, *see* Pierre de Dreux; crusaders from, [332](#)
- Bruges, [362](#), [366](#), [401](#), [402](#)
- Bruni, Francesco, papal secretary (d. ca. 1386), [470](#)
- Brunswick, *see* Otto IV
- Brusa (Bursa), [359](#), [360](#), [362](#), [364](#), [376](#), [404](#)
- Brussels, [368](#); MS. at, [155n](#), [157](#)
- Bucelet (Araklovon), [148](#)
- Buda, [288](#), [300](#), [347](#), [348](#), [360](#)
- Buddhists, [97n](#)
- Budua, [396](#), [404](#)
- Bugey, [293](#)
- Bugia (al-Bijāyah), [330](#); “king” (emir) of, *see* ‘Abd-al-‘Azīz II
- Bulgaria, [29](#), [52](#), [62](#), [69](#), [73](#), [77](#), [85](#), [92](#), [133](#), [183](#), [287](#), [288](#), [300–305](#), [329](#), [341](#), [439](#); king of, *see* Ioannitsa 1204–1207; tsars of, *see* Simeon 893–927, Asenids 1186–1257, Constantine Tich 1257–1277, Šišmanids 1323–1396; *see also* Maria (Kyratsa)
- Bulgarians, [3](#), [27](#), [35](#), [43](#), [51n](#), [55](#), [59–61](#), [63](#), [64](#), [72](#), [73](#), [91](#), [92](#), [109](#), [120](#), [166n](#), [287](#), [293](#), [300](#), [302–306](#), [309](#), [329](#), [343](#), [367](#), [438](#)
- Bulgarinus de Ania, Carian corsair (fl. 1275), [428](#)
- Buonconvento, [170](#)
- Burgas, Gulf of, [302](#), [305](#)
- Burgundy, county of, [368](#), and *see* Franche-Comté; count of, *see* Étienne
- Burgundy (Bourgogne), duchy, [30](#), [33](#), [95](#), [293](#), [343](#), [346](#), [360](#), [362](#), [366](#), [368](#), [401–403](#), [405](#), [408](#), [413](#), [418](#), [421n](#), [422](#); crusaders from, [333](#), [347](#), [350](#), [359](#), [402](#); dukes of, *see* Odo III 1192–1218, Hugh IV 1218–1273, Robert II 1273–1305, Odo IV 1315–1349, Philip II (Valois line) 1363–1404, John of Nevers 1404–1419, Philip III 1419–1467; *see also* Louis of Burgundy; individuals from, [123](#), [232](#); knights from, [50](#), [56](#), [302](#), [418](#); marshals of, *see* Guy de Pontarlier, Guillaume de la Trémoille
- Bustron, Florio, Cypriote annalist (ca. 1489), [382](#)
- Butrinto, [81](#), [130](#), [435n](#), and *see* Nicholas of Butrinto
- Byzantine empire, to 1204: [1](#), [3](#), [6–14](#), [16](#), [17](#), [21](#), [33](#), [331](#), [410](#), [432](#); 1204–1261, *see* Nicaea, empire; 1261–1453: [90](#), [100](#), [101](#), [103](#), [106–109](#), [114](#), [116n](#), [119–125](#), [133](#), [136](#), [138–140](#), [142–146](#), [149n](#), [160](#), [163](#), [164](#), [169](#), [178n](#), [180](#), [181](#), [191](#), [205](#), [213–215](#), [220](#), [225–227](#), [234](#), [239n](#), [287](#), [288](#), [300](#), [306](#), [313](#), [314](#), [322](#), [341](#), [346](#), [364](#), [370](#), [371](#), [373](#), [378](#), [380](#), [400](#), [428](#), [455](#), [462](#); emperors of, at Constantinople to 1204, *see* Leo VI 886–912, Constantine VII 913–959, Basil II (963) 976–1025, Comneni, Angeli, Alexius V Ducas in 1204; at Nicaea (1204) 1208–1261: *see* Lascarids, Michael VIII Palaeologus 1259–1261; at Constantinople 1261–1453, *see* Palaeologi, John VI Cantacuzenus 1347–1354
- Caballarius, Michael, Byzantine general (d. ca. 1278), [426](#)
- Cabaret d'Orville, Jean, French chronicler (fl. 1429), [292n](#), [331–341](#), [370](#), [375](#)
- Cadiz, [391–393](#)
- Cadmea (at Thebes), [28](#), [29](#), [80](#), [95](#), [418](#), [422](#), [433](#), [444](#), [452](#)
- Caesarea (Maritima), [108](#), [280](#)
- Caesarius of Arles, theologian (d. 542), [117n](#)
- Caetani, Benedetto, *see* Boniface VIII
- Caetani, Giacomo, cardinal 1295–1341: [175](#)
- Caffa (Kaffa), [202](#), [206](#), [221](#), [258](#), [382](#)
- Cagliari, [333](#), [334](#), [338](#), [464n](#); bishop of, *see* A. Blasi; Gulf of, [334](#)
- Cairel, Élias, troubador (fl. 1200), [7](#), [27n](#)
- Cairo (al-Qāhirah), [167n](#), [267–272](#), [274–278](#), [281–283](#), [291](#), [339](#), [356](#), [385](#), [388](#); soldans at, *see* Aiyūbids, Mamluks
- Calabria, [189](#), [392](#)
- Calais, [232](#), [331](#), [373](#)
- Calampaces, Theodore, Byzantine general (fl. 1256), [74n](#)
- Calbani, Niccolò, Venetian litigant (in 1227), [57n](#)
- Calergi, Cretan family, [249](#), [250](#), [255](#)
- Calergi, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Calergi, Zanachi, Cretan leader (fl. 1364), [254](#)
- Callistus I, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1350–1353, 1355–1363: [228](#)
- Calopherus, John Lascaris, son-in-law of Érarid III le Maure; titular count of Cephalonia (d. 1392), [157](#), [265](#), [321n](#), [329](#)
- Caltabellotta, peace of (1302), [143](#), [164n](#), [441](#), [446](#)
- Cambarou, Étienne, bishop of S. Pons de Thomières 1346–1348: [203](#)
- Cambrai, League of (1508), [400](#)
- Camera Apostolica, [118](#), [176](#), [184–186](#), [187n](#), [194](#), [202](#), [203](#), [205](#), [206](#), [208–211](#), [212n](#), [214n](#), [215](#), [217](#), [218](#), [220](#), [223](#), [225n](#), [226n](#), [231](#), [232n](#), [235](#), [245n](#), [286](#), [462](#)
- Camera del Formento (Grain Bank, in Venice), [317–319](#)
- Campagna (Campania), [169](#), [231](#)
- Campaneia, Orthodox bishop of (in 1213), [30](#)
- Campanus, conspirator (fl. 1246), [62](#)

- Campanus d'Itri, James, bishop of Ischia *ca.* 1358–1359, of Martirano 1359–1363, archbishop of Otranto 1363–1376, titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1376–1378, cardinal (Avignone) 1378–*ca.* 1387: 463n
- Campofranco, treaty of (1288), 148n
- Campofregoso, *see* Domenico di Campofregoso
- Canale, *see* Martino and Pietro da Canale
- Cancellieri, Federico, Pistoiese captain (*fl.* 1346), 204
- Candia (Heraklion), 178, 216, 249, 250, 251n, 254, 258, 262, 325n, 335, 344n, 387n, 399, 461n, 463, and *see* Pasqualigo di Candia; dukes of, *see* Crete, dukes of
- Cane, Facino, lord of Alessandria, governor of Milan 1410–1412: 398
- Canea, 254
- Canina, 86, 137
- Cantacuzeni, Byzantine noble family, 127, and *see* John VI Cantacuzenus (1346) 1347–1354, Helena (Cantacuzena)
- Cantacuzenus, father of John VI; Byzantine governor at Mistra (d. *ca.* 1316), 126
- Cantacuzenus, John, brother-in-law of Isaac II Angelus (d. 1205?), 24
- Cantacuzenus, Manuel, son of John VI; despot at Mistra 1349–1380: 127, 160, 459
- Canterbury, 409
- Capellekti (pirates), 419
- Capetians, royal dynasty in France 987–1848: 7, 146, 147, 174, 196, and *see* Philip II 1180–1223, Louis VIII 1223–1226, Louis IX 1226–1270, Philip III 1270–1285, Philip IV 1285–1314, Philip V 1317–1322, Charles IV 1322–1328, Philip VI (Valois line) 1328–1350, John II 1350–1364, Charles V 1364–1380, Charles VI 1380–1422, Charles VII 1422–1461, Francis I (Angoulême line) 1515–1547; *see also* Angevins, Burgundy (Valois line), Charles of Valois
- Capgrave, John, English cleric (d. 1464), 373
- Capodistria (Koper), 365
- Capraia, 334
- Capua, 136n; Hospitaller prior of, *see* Isnard de Albarno; prince of, 127
- Capuano, Peter (of Amalfi), cardinal 1192–1214: 6, 8–10, 15, 38
- Cardinals ("Sacred College"), 106, 107, 114, 117, 118, 123, 134, 147, 160, 163, 169, 174, 175, 181, 208, 209, 211, 215, 218, 219, 221, 224, 225, 230, 231, 243, 244, 274, 285, 294, 313, 327, 340, 342n, and *see* P. Capuano 1192–1214, Benedict 1200–1216, John de' Conti 1200–1213, Pelagius (Galvani) 1205–1230, G. Colonna 1212–1245, R. Grosparmy 1261–1270, Bonaventura (Fidanza) 1273–1274, N. Orsini 1288–1342, P. Colonna 1288–1326, L. Brancaccio 1294–1312, G. Caetani 1295–1341, L. Patrasso 1300–1311, L. Fieschi 1300–1336, Nicholas (Alberti) 1303–1321, Bertrand du Poujet 1316–1352, P. Gomez de Barroso 1327–1348, E. Talleyrand 1331–1364, Bertrand de Déaux 1338–1355, G. Court 1338–1361, Guy de Boulogne 1342–1373, H. Roger 1342–1363, Gil de Alborno 1350–1367, Pierre de Cros 1350–1361, Androin de la Roche 1361–1369, Anglic de Grimoard 1366–1388, Marco da Viterbo 1366–1369, A. Acciajuoli 1384–1408, Isidore (of Kiev) 1439–1463, Bessarion (of Trebizond) 1439–1472, Amadeo (VIII of Savoy) 1449–1451, G. Castiglione 1456–1460, and *also* J. Campanus d'Itri (Avignone), 1378–*ca.* 1387, Pierre d'Ameil (Avignone), 1378–1389
- Caresini, Raffain, Venetian chancellor (*fl.* 1381), 250n, 254, 261n, 263, 323, 324
- Caria, coast of, 428n
- Carintana dalle Carceri, sister of Narzotto; triarch (or hexarch) of Euboea (d. 1255), 77, 78, 80
- Carinthia, 249n; duke of, 85
- Carmayn (or Carmeyn), Simondo, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), 295n
- Carmelites, order, 193, 197, 229, 273, 274, and *see* Albert de Nogerio, John de S. Catarina, Philip (of Salona), Pierre Thomas, Sybert of Beek
- Carmesson, Juan, Franciscan provincial (*fl.* 1366), 273
- Caroldo, Gian Giacomo, Venetian official (*fl.* 1500), 245n, 246n, 253n, 290, 291, 317–321
- Carpaccio, Vittore, Venetian artist (d. 1522), 284
- Carpachos (Scarpanto), 3
- Carraresi, ruling family at Padua 1318–1405: 243, 290, 300n, 322, 323, 396, and *see* Jacopo and Francesco da Carrara
- Carthage, 107; "Council" of (398), 117n
- Carthusians, order, 176
- Carystus, 18, 19, 35, 408, 410n, 415, 425, 426, 448, 450, 451, 454, 462; lady of, 80n; lords of, *see* Othon de Cicon, Boniface of Verona, Alfonso and Boniface Fadrique; *see also* Sivino da Caristo
- Casimir III ("the Great"), king of Poland 1333–1370: 247n, 249n
- Casole, 58; abbot of, *see* Nectarius
- Cassandra, 166n, 441; Orthodox bishop of, *see* Strymbakon
- Cassano, 259; bishops of, *see* John de Papasidero, Simon Atumano (?)
- Casse, Jean, Marseillais skipper (*fl.* 1366), 295n, 302, 304
- Castel dell' Uovo (at Naples), 105, 130
- Castellammare, 312
- Castello (Venice), 79n; bishop of, *see* N. Morosini
- Castelnuovo (at Naples), 312, 315
- Castelrosso (Castellorizzo), 266
- Castiglione, Giovanni, cardinal 1456–1460: 2
- Castile (Castilla), 96, 170, 194, 373; and León, Hospitaller prior of, *see* J. Fernández de Heredia; kings of, *see* Alfonso X 1252–1284, Henry III 1390–1406; *see also* Blanche of Castile
- Castle Ashby, lord of, 253
- Castoria, 45, 74, 85, 89
- Castracani, Castruccio, lord of Lucca 1316–1328: 172
- Castrofilatas, Calojohn, of Mesembria (*fl.* 1366), 304
- Catalan Grand Company, in Byzantine empire, 163, 164n, 166n, 168, 169, 441; in Frankish Greece, 156n, 189, 206, 441–456, 459, 460, 465, and *see* Athens, duchy of, and Catalans in Greece
- Catalans, 330; in Crete, 250; in Egypt, 167, 270, 278, 280; in Greece, 153, 154, 157n, 159, 160, 162, 177n, 189, 206, 258, 298, 372, 424, 427, 441–468, 471; in Sardinia, 334, 338; in Sicily, 141–143, 145, 152, 165, 206n, 227, 237, 294, 331, 340, 442, 446, 455n, 461, 465, 466; in Spain, 170, 446, 455n, 461; in Tunisia, 337, 455n
- Catalonia (Catalunya), 138, 148, 149n, 330, 443n, 467, 469, and *see* Francesc of Catalonia; kingdom of, *see* Aragon-Catalonia; patron saint of, 456
- Catherine of Courtenay, daughter of Philip and Beatrice; titular Latin empress of Constantinople 1283–1307, wife of Charles of Valois 1301–1307: 164, 167, 168n, 435n
- Catherine of Valois, daughter of Charles and Catherine; titular Latin empress of Constantinople 1307–1346, wife of Philip I of Taranto 1313–1331, regent of Achaea 1333–1346: 153, 156, 159, 160, 161n, 164n, 187

- Catholic Church, *see* Roman Catholic Church
 Cattaneo, Ottobuono, Genoese captain of Smyrna 1371–1374: [328](#)
 Cattaro (Kotor), [404](#)
 Caupena, Catalan family at Aegina (to 1451), [471](#), and *see* Alioto [1](#) and Antonello de Caupena
 Cefalù, bishop of, *see* Jacopo de Nernia
 Celestine IV (Goffredo Castiglione), cardinal 1227–1241, pope in 1241: [64](#)
 Celestine V (Pietro da Morrone), pope in 1294 (d. 1296, canonized), [123](#), [163](#)
 Celestines, order, [241](#), [360](#), [367](#)
 Celsi, Lorenzo, doge of Venice 1361–1365: [242](#), [243](#), [247](#)–[256](#), [258](#), [261](#), [263](#), [278](#), [459](#)
 Ceneda, rectors of, [281](#)
 Centurione (“d’Oltremare” or “Oltremarino”), Giovanni, Genoese admiral (in 1390), [334](#), [338](#), [384](#), [387](#)
 Ceos (Zea, Kea), 24n, [408](#), 410n, [462](#)
 Cephalonia, [3](#), 37n, [38](#), [90](#), 319n, [364](#), [381](#), [419](#); bishop of, [419](#); counts of, [31](#), [68](#), 87n, [90](#), and *see* Margaritone of Brindisi, Matteo, Riccardo, and John II Orsini, John Lascaris Calophorus (titular)
 Cephissus, river, [28](#), 442n
 Cerigo (Cythera), [297](#), [426](#), [451](#)
 Cerigotto (Anticythera), [426](#)
 Černomen (Chernomen), battle of (1371), 246n, [320](#)
 Certosa, Carthusian monastery (near Florence), [161](#)
 Cesena, [173](#), and *see* Michael of Cesena
 Chabaron, Constantine, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1257), [74](#), [84](#)
 Chaise Dieu (Casa Dei), [176](#), [223](#)
 Chalandritza, [31](#), 153n, [154](#)
 Chalcedon, [9](#), and *see* Nicholas of Chalcedon
 Chalcidice, [23](#), [190](#), [377](#), [441](#)
 Chalcocondylas (Chalkokondyles), Laonicus, Byzantine historian (d. *ca.* 1490), [316](#), [317](#), 472n
 Chalon-sur-Saône, *see* Hugh and Louis of Chalon
 Chambéry, [291](#), [292](#), [296](#), [308](#), [396](#)
 Champagne, [49](#); counts of, *see* Hugh [1](#), Theobald III; knights from, [56](#), [405](#)
 Champlitte (-et-le-Prélot), family, [34](#), and *see* Guillaume, Hugh, and Louis of Champlitte
 Chantilly, 375n
 Charenton, [375](#)
 Charlemagne, co-king of the Franks 768–771, king 771–800, emperor 800–814: [1](#), [171](#)
 Charles IV (“the Fair”), son of Philip IV; Capetian king of France 1322–1328: [175](#)
 Charles V (“the Wise”), son of John II; Capetian king of France 1364–1380: 174n, [211](#), [232](#), [249](#), [291](#), [294](#), [399](#)
 Charles VI, son of Charles V; Capetian king of France 1380–1422: 296n, [331](#)–[333](#), [337](#), [340](#), [341](#), [344](#), [346](#), [347](#), [358](#)–[361](#), [363](#), [364](#), [366](#), [370](#)–[372](#), [374](#), 375n, [376](#), [391](#), [393](#)–[396](#), [398](#), [399](#)
 Charles VII, son of Charles VI; Capetian king of France [1422](#)–[1461](#): [402](#)
 Charles, son of Charles of Valois; count of Alençon 1325–1346: 181n
 Charles IV (of Luxemburg), son of John of Luxemburg; king (I) of Bohemia 1346–1378, of Germany 1346–1347, emperor 1347 (crowned 1355)–1378: [172](#), [229](#), 236n, [242](#), [247](#), [255](#), 267n, [273](#), [279](#), 286n, 288n, [294](#)
 Charles II (“the Bad”), son of Philip III; king of Navarre [1349](#)–[1387](#): [246](#)
 Charles III, son of Charles II; king of Navarre 1387–1425: [373](#)
 Charles, Latin (*fl.* 1258), 76n, and *see* Muzalon, George
 Charles Martel, son of Charles II of Anjou (d. 1295), [150](#)
 Charles I of Anjou, son of Louis VIII of France; Angevin king of Naples and Sicily (1266) 1268–1282, “king” of Albania 1272–1285, prince of Achaea 1278–1285, king of Naples 1282–1285: 82n, [98](#), [100](#), 102–[109](#), [111](#), 112n, [119](#), 120n, [121](#)–[123](#), 125n, 126–[146](#), [148](#), [149](#), 422n, [427](#), [431](#)–[433](#), [435](#), [436](#); wife of, *see* Beatrice (of Provence)
 Charles II (“the Lame”) of Anjou, son of Charles I and Beatrice; Angevin king of Naples 1285–1309, prince of Achaea 1285–1289: [123](#), [128](#), [135](#), [142](#)–[144](#), [147](#), [148](#), [150](#)–[153](#), 164n, 201n, [433](#)–[438](#), [440](#)
 Charles of Durazzo, son of John of Gravina; Angevin duke of Durazzo 1335–1348: 199n; wife of, *see* Maria of Anjou
 Charles III of Durazzo, grandson of John of Gravina; Angevin duke of Durazzo 1368–1386, king of Naples 1381–1386, prince of Achaea 1383–1386, claimant to Hungary 1385–1386: [325](#), [342](#)
 Charles of Valois, son of Philip III of France; count of Anjou, titular Latin emperor of Constantinople 1301–1307 (d. 1325), [164](#)–[170](#); wife of, *see* Catherine of Courtenay
 Charolais, [368](#)
 Châteaumorand, *see* Jean de Châteaumorand
 Châtillon (-sur-Loing), *see* Gaucher and Jeanne de Châtillon
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, English poet (d. 1400), [422](#)
 Chauderon, Jean, nephew of William of Villehardouin; lord of Conversano (to 1289), 148n, [433](#)
 Chavannes, lord of, *see* Étienne de la Baume
 Chernigov, prince of, 73n
 Chernomen, *see* Černomen
 Cherso (Cres), [404](#)
 Chersonese, Thracian, [18](#), [19](#), [57](#)
 Chiaramonte, *see* Manfredino de Chiaramonte
 China, [97](#), [146](#), [377](#)
 Chinard, Gazo, son of Philippe; Angevin vicar-general of Albania (from 1272), [109](#)
 Chinard, Philippe, lord of Corfu 1266–1267: 59n, [81](#), 82n, [104](#), [109](#); wife of, *see* Maria Petraliphas
 Chioggia, [322](#), [323](#), [329](#), [455](#)
 Chios (Scio), [3](#), [18](#), [33](#), [52](#), [104](#), 205–207, [220](#), [298](#), [324](#), [362](#), [377](#), [382](#), [385](#), [390](#), [394](#); bishops of, *see* Oddino, Manfred; lord of, *see* M. Zaccaria; Mahona of, 207n, 247n, [399](#)
 Chloumoutsi (Clermont, Castel Tornese), [49](#), 153n
 Chomatianus, Demetrius, Orthodox archbishop of Ochrida (from 1217), [29](#), [43](#), [51](#), [52](#)
 Choniates, Michael, brother of Nicetas; Orthodox metropolitan of Athens 1182–1204 (titular 1204–1215, d. by 1220), [22](#), [23](#), [406](#), [407](#), [410](#), 415n, [416](#), [418](#), [419](#), [462](#), [466](#)
 Choniates, Nicetas, Byzantine historian (d. *ca.* 1215), [3](#), [9](#), [12](#), 16, 20n, [22](#), [405](#)
 Christine de Pisan, French poet (d. *ca.* 1430), [340](#)
 Christoupolis (Kavalla), [52](#)
Chronicle of Novgorod (1016–1471), 6n, 9n
Chronicle of the Morea, [10](#), [25](#), [30](#), [32](#)–[34](#), [49](#), [68](#), [79](#), 82n, [83](#), [85](#), [87](#), 89n, [98](#), [126](#), [154](#)–[158](#), [416](#), [420](#), [421](#), [437](#)
 Chrysoberges, Nicephorus, Byzantine writer (*ca.* 1203), 11n
 Chrysoloras, Manuel, Byzantine humanist (d. 1415), 372n, [374](#)
 Church, Byzantine, or Greek Orthodox, *see* Greek Orthodox Church

- Church, Latin, or Roman Catholic, *see* Roman Catholic Church
- Cicogna, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Cicon, *see* Guidotto, Jacques, *and* Othon de Cicon
- Cigalla, Cassano, Genoese envoy (in 1368), [281](#), [282](#)
- Cigalla, Cattaneo, Genoese envoy (in 1403), [391–393](#)
- Cilicia, 103, *and see* Armenia, Cilician
- Cilly (Celje), count of, *see* Hermann II
- Cistercians, order, 7n, [20](#), [46](#), 82n, [95](#), [112](#), [408](#), [418](#), [440](#)
- Cîteaux, Cistercian monastery, [7](#), 27n
- Cividale, [396](#), [397](#)
- Civitavecchia, [308](#)
- Clavijo, Ruy Gonzalez de, Spanish envoy (in 1403), [360](#)
- Clazomenae, [182](#)
- Cleidas, George, Orthodox metropolitan of Cyzicus (in 1261), [94](#)
- Clement IV (Guy de Foulques, Guido Fulcodi), cardinal 1261–1265, pope 1265–1268: 77n, [100–108](#), [110](#), [123](#), 141n, [417](#)
- Clement V (Bertrand de Got), archbishop of Bordeaux 1299–1305, pope 1305–1314: [153](#), [163–171](#), [174](#), 176n, 179n, [187](#), [446–448](#), [453](#), [463](#)
- Clement VI (Pierre Roger), cardinal 1338–1342, pope 1342–1352: [169](#), [172](#), [175](#), [176](#), [179](#), [182–206](#), 208–[224](#), [230](#), [238](#), [244](#), [247](#), [263](#), [271](#), [327](#), [328](#), 454–[456](#), [460](#), [462](#), [463](#), [469](#)
- Clement VII (Robert of Geneva, son of Amadeo III), cardinal 1371–1378, pope at Avignon 1378–1394: [169](#), 173n, [294](#), [333](#), [340](#), [342](#), 463n, 464n, [466](#)
- Clermont (de l'Oise), counts of, *see* Louis I, John
- Clermont (in Auvergne); [211](#)
- Clermont (in Dauphiné), lord of, *see* Aymar de Clermont
- Clermont (in Greece), *see* Chloulmoutsi
- Clissura, [137](#)
- Cluniacs, order, [20](#)
- Cluny, monks of, 27n
- Cocinus, Gregory, Orthodox metropolitan of Ochrida (in 1367), [310](#)
- Colard des Armoires, French envoy to Bayazid I (in 1397), [363](#)
- Colart de Calleville, French governor of Genoa (in 1399), [370](#)
- Coligny, [293](#), *and see* Hugh of Coligny
- Collo, 141n
- Cologne (Köln), archbishops of, [173](#); silver standard of, 6n, 50n
- Cologny, 27n
- Colonna (Sunium), Cape, [298](#)
- Colonna, Giovanni, cardinal 1212–1245: 41n, [44](#), [45](#), [47](#), [48](#), 408n, [416](#), [418](#)
- Colonna, Pietro, cardinal 1288–1326: [175](#)
- Colonna, Sciarra, Italian Ghibelline (d. 1329), [163](#)
- Colonnaesi, Roman family, 45n, [163](#)
- Comneni, Byzantine imperial dynasty at Constantinople 1057–1185: [3](#), [5](#), [64](#), *and see* Alexius I 1081–1118, Manuel I 1143–1180, Maria; at Trebizond 1204–1461 (“Grand Comneni”), [52](#), *and see* David 1204–1214, George 1266–1280
- Comtat-Venaissin, [169](#), [189](#), [232](#); governor of, [233](#), [285](#), [327](#)
- Condulmer, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Conegliano, 260n, [365](#), [366](#)
- Conigliera (Kuriates?), [334](#), [335](#), [337](#)
- Conon of Béthune, French baron (d. ca. 1219), [16](#), 45n
- Conrad, canon of Athens (fl. 1236), [429](#)
- Conrad, Latin archbishop of Athens, ca. 1253–1268: [96](#), 420n
- Conrad of Montferrat, son of Guglielmo III; marquis of Montferrat 1188–1192, king of Jerusalem 1190–1192: [7](#)
- Conradin, grandson of Frederick II; Hohenstaufen king of Jerusalem 1254–1268, of Sicily 1254–1258: [105](#)
- Constance (“Anna”), daughter of Frederick II (Hohenstaufen); wife of John III Vatatzes 1244–1254 (d. 1307), 62n, 90n
- Constance, daughter of Manfred (Hohenstaufen); wife of Pedro III of Aragon-Catalonia 1262–1285 (d. 1302), [138](#), [139](#)
- Constance of Sicily, wife of Henry VI (Hohenstaufen) 1186–1197 (d. 1198), [4](#)
- Constantine, [141n](#)
- Constantine, Dominican; bishop of Orvieto ca. 1250–1257: 71n, [74](#), [77](#)
- Constantine VII (“Porphyrogenitus”), Byzantine emperor 913–920, co-emperor 920–944, emperor 944–959: 37n
- Constantine Ducas, son of John I; lord of Neopatras 1295–1302: 436n, [438](#)
- Constantine Lascaris, Byzantine “emperor” 1204–1205: 13n
- Constantine XI Palaeologus (“Dragases”), son of Manuel II and Helena; co-despot at Mistra 1428–1443, despot 1443–1448, Byzantine emperor 1448 (crowned 1449)–1453: 13n, [162](#)
- Constantine Tich (Tichomir), nephew of Stephen Urosh I; tsar of Bulgaria 1257–1277: [73](#), [76](#), 85n, [91](#), [92](#), [106](#); wife of, *see* Irene (Lascaris)
- Constantinople (Byzantium, Istanbul), emperors at, *see* Byzantine empire, Latin empire; Latin patriarchs of, [12–14](#), [149](#), 192n, [233](#), [235](#), [409](#), [411](#), [415](#), [453](#), 461–[463](#), *and see* T. Morosini 1205–1211, Gervasius 1215–1219, Simon 1227?–1232, Niccolò di Castro Arquato 1234–1251, (titular) Peter 1286–1302, Leonard 1302–?1305, Nicholas 1308–?1331, Henry d’Asti 1339–1345, Stephen in 1346, Pierre Thomas 1364–1366, Paulus 1366–1370, J. Campanus d’Itri 1376–1378, Isidore 1459–1463, Bessarion 1463–1472; Orthodox patriarchs of, [47](#), [70](#), [321](#), 406n, *and see* Photius 858–867, 877–886, Nicholas I Mysticus 901–907, 912–925, Nicholas II Muntanes 1186–1189, George II Xiphilinus 1191–1198, John X Camaterus 1198–1204; (at Nicaea 1204–1261) John X 1204–1206, Germanus II 1222–1240, Manuel II 1244–1254, Arsenius 1255–1259; (at Constantinople 1261–1453) Arsenius 1261–1265, Germanus III 1265–1266, Joseph I 1266–1275, 1282–1283, John XI Beccus 1275–1279, 1279–1282, Gregory (George of Cyprus) 1283–1289, Athanasius I 1289–1293, 1303–1309, Callistus I 1350–1353, 1355–1363, Philotheus Cocinus 1353–1354, 1364–1376, Antonius IV 1389–1390, 1391–1397, Joseph II 1416–1439: *see also* Byzantine empire, Greek Orthodox Church, Latin empire
- Contarini, Andrea, doge of Venice 1368–1382: [282](#), [314](#), [323](#), [327](#), [460](#)
- Contarini, Jacopo, doge of Venice 1275–1280: 134n
- Conti, Guglielmo, Latin bishop of Sozopolis (Sisopolis, from 1356), [226](#), [227](#)
- Conversano, 148n; count of, 82n, *and see* Louis d’Enghien; lord of, *see* J. Chauderon
- Conza, archbishop of, *see* Philip
- Copenhagen, MS. at, 155n, [157](#)
- Copts, sect, 167n, [272](#)
- Corasio, Lenzio (or Leuzio), bishop of Bitonto 1283–1317: [150](#)
- Corfu (Corcyra), [8](#), 9n, 17n, 19n, [35](#), [58–60](#), [81](#), [150](#),

- 151n, [155](#), [233](#), [245](#), [258](#), [297](#), [307](#), 316n, 319n, [364](#), [380–382](#), 383n, [392](#), 407n, 435n; Latin archbishops of, [186](#), and see Stephen, Demetrius; lord of, see P. Chinard; Orthodox metropolitan of, see G. Bardanes; Venetian bailies at, 380n, [381](#), 404n
- Corigliano, count of, see Robert of S. Severino
- Corinth, 20n, [22](#), [23](#), [25](#), [34](#), [36–39](#), [48](#), [66](#), [70](#), [150](#), [160](#), [233](#), [258](#), [405](#), [406](#), [411](#), [429](#), [440](#), [447](#), [471](#); castellany of, [151](#), [152](#), [160](#), 319n; Gulf of, [25](#), [31](#), [45](#), [151](#), [419](#), [435](#), [439](#), [449](#); Latin archbishops of, [36–38](#), [47](#), [64](#), [96](#), [149](#), [419](#), and see Gautier, William of Moerbeke, James ([2](#)), Bartholomew; lords of, see L. Sgourus, Nerio I Acciajuoli; Orthodox metropolitan of, see Nicholas
- Corinthia, [34](#), [127](#)
- Corner, Federico, Venetian (*fl.* 1366), [278](#), [294](#)
- Corner, Marco, doge of Venice 1365–1368: [255](#), [274](#), [276](#), [277](#), [287–290](#), 291n, [293](#), [297](#)
- Corneri, Venetian family in Crete, [254](#)
- Coron, [19](#), [25](#), [34](#), [48](#), [68](#), [144](#), [155](#), [162](#), [178](#), [207](#), [238](#), [239](#), [297](#), [300](#), [307](#), [326](#), 344n, 356n, [380](#), [392](#), [405](#); canon of, see Grifon of Arezzo; castellans of, 250n, 380n, [392](#), 472n; Gulf of, [297](#); Latin bishops of, [38](#), [96](#), 258n, and see G. Scarlatto, L. Torriani, Pierre Thomas
- Coronea, [408](#), 410n, [429](#), [462](#), [466](#); bishops of, see Antonio, Albert de Nogerio
- Corsica, [152](#), [163](#), [169](#), [334](#), [446](#), [455](#)
- Cortusi, Guglielmo, Paduan judge (*fl.* 1344), [190](#)
- Corycus (Gorigos), [238](#), [240](#), [282](#)
- Cos (Kos, Lango), [18](#), [52](#), [104](#)
- Cosmidium, monastery (at Constantinople), [94](#)
- Cotrone (Crotona), Latin bishops of, see John, Niccolò
- Coucy (-le-Château), count of, see Enguerrand VII
- Councils, oecumenical, [309](#), [310](#), [320](#), and see Sardica ([343](#)), Nicaea (787), Bari (1098), Third Lateran (1179), Fourth Lateran (1215), Lyon (1245, 1274), Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439); see also Carthage ([398](#)), Neopatra (1276), Vienne (1312), Pisa (1409)
- Court, Guillaume, nephew of Benedict XII; cardinal 1338–1361: [183](#), 465n
- Courtenay, house of, [2](#), [55](#), [77](#), [96](#), [104](#), [119](#), [120](#), [124](#), and see Agnes, Baldwin II, Catherine, Peter, Philip ([2](#)), and Robert of Courtenay; lordship of, [65](#), 66n
- Courthezon, lord of, see Bertrand des Baux
- Courtrai, [366](#)
- Cracow, 249n; bishop of, see P. Radolinski
- Crambusa, [266](#), 267n
- Crécy (-en-Ponthieu), battle of (1346), [172](#), [453](#)
- Cremona, 416n; bishop of, see Sicard
- Crete, [16–18](#), 19n, [33](#), [91](#), [144](#), [167](#), [177–182](#), 212n, [228](#), [233](#), [236](#), [237](#), [240](#), [242](#), [245](#), [249–258](#), [264](#), [283](#), [323–326](#), [328](#), [356](#), [392](#), [397](#), 461n, [472](#); dukes of, 52n, [163](#), [178](#), 180n, [216](#), [236](#), [239](#), [262](#), 264n, 325n, and see N. Ziani, L. Dandolo; Latin archbishops of, see Leonardo, F. Michiel, O. Dolfen, Pierre Thomas; ships from, [381](#), [382](#), [389](#)
- Crimea, [382](#)
- Crispi, Venetian ducal family at Naxos 1383–1566: 19n
- Crispo, Francesco, duke of Naxos 1383–1397: 463n
- Crispo, Jacopo IV, duke of Naxos 1564–1566: 19n
- Croatia, 73n, 228n, [342](#), [356](#), [357](#), [404](#); ban of, 254n; people of, [404](#)
- Croia, [74](#); bishop of, see Romanus
- Crusades, see First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, “Sixth,” and “Seventh” Crusade, Albigenian crusade, Tunisia, Smyrniote crusade, Alexandria, Balkan crusade, Nicopolis
- Cumans (Kumans, Polovtsy, “Scythians”), [72](#), 74n, [85](#), [88](#), [92](#), [93](#), 127n, 166n, [423](#)
- Curzola (Korčula), [404](#)
- Cutritzaces, Greek at Constantinople (*fl.* 1261), [92](#), [93](#)
- Cyclades, [149](#), [155](#), [462](#); lord of, see L. Gabalas
- Cydones, Demetrius, Byzantine scholar (d. ca. 1398), 241n, [259](#), [288](#), 317n, [319](#), [329](#), [470](#)
- Cyprus, [3n](#), and see George of Cyprus; under Greeks to 1191: [33](#), [158](#); under Lusignans 1191–1473: [69](#), 70n, [81](#), [113](#), [190](#), [196](#), [210](#), [217](#), [218](#), [222](#), 229–[231](#), [233](#), 236n, [237–248](#), [252](#), [258–260](#), 262n, [264](#), [265](#), [271–283](#), [297](#), [307](#), [328](#), [337](#), [362](#), [382–388](#), [393](#); chancellor of, see Philippe de Mézières; kings of, see Lusignans; Mahone of, [382](#), [383](#), [386](#); ships from, 188n, [191](#), [209](#), [220](#), [229–231](#), [238–240](#)
- Cyzicus, 164n; Orthodox metropolitan of, see G. Cleidas
- Dalle Carceri, Veronese family at Euboea, see Carintana, Giovanni, Grapella, Leone, Marino II, Narzotto, Pietro, and Ravano dalle Carceri
- Dalmatia, 228n, [248](#), [254](#), [258](#), [286](#), [290](#), [322](#), [342](#), [356](#), [357](#), [359](#), 360n, [367](#), [401](#), [403](#), [404](#); ban of, 254n; coast of, [130](#), [227](#), [307](#), [328](#), [403](#)
- Dalmat, Felipe, viscount of Rocaberti, vicar-general of Athens (1379) 1381–1382 (1386; d. 1392), [467–469](#)
- Damala (Troezen), 37n, [38](#), [433](#); lord of, see William de la Roche
- Damandi, Peter, archdeacon of Limassol, nuncio (in 1359), [235](#), [247](#)
- Damanhūr, [269](#)
- Damascus (Dimashq), [270](#), 277n, [283](#), [339](#), [363](#), [388](#); rulers of, [44](#)
- Damietta (Dimyāt), [44](#), 45n, [54](#), [280](#)
- Dandolo, Andrea, doge of Venice 1343–1354: [79](#), [185](#), 190n, [191](#), 193n, [206](#), 210n, [214](#), 215n, [218–221](#), [287](#)
- Dandolo, Enrico, doge of Venice 1192–1205: [8–11](#), [13–16](#), 19n, 20n
- Dandolo, Enrico, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1383), [325](#)
- Dandolo, Francesco, doge of Venice 1329–1339: [159](#), [180](#), [181](#), [453](#)
- Dandolo, Francesco, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1317–1319: [448](#), [449](#)
- Dandolo, Giovanni, doge of Venice 1280–1289: [134](#), [135](#), [144](#), [145](#), [431](#)
- Dandolo, Leonardo, duke of Crete (in 1363), [249](#), [250](#), [254](#), [287](#), 288n, [289](#)
- Dandolo, Leonardo, Venetian envoy (in 1383), [324](#)
- Dandolo, Marino, lord of Andros 1207–1233: 19n, [428–431](#); wife of, see Felisa
- Dandolo, Saracin, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), [291](#), 292n, 294n, 295n
- Dante Alighieri, Italian poet (d. 1321), [139](#), [163](#), [422](#)
- Danube (Donau, Dunav), river, 108n, [288](#), [300](#), [341](#), 346–[351](#), [354](#), [356](#), [358](#)
- Daphni, abbey, [408](#), [418](#), [440](#); abbots of, [46](#), [47](#), 82n, [418](#)
- Daphnusia, [92](#), [93](#)
- Dardanelles (Hellespont), [72](#), [91](#), [92](#), [236](#), 239n, [298](#), [311](#), [321](#), [326](#), [356](#), [377](#)
- Darnius, Dalmat, Catalan squire (*fl.* 1399), 370n
- Datini, Francesco, Pratese merchant (*fl.* 1403), [383](#)
- Daulia, [49](#), [408](#), [409](#), [429](#), [462](#); archdeacon of, see Hugo; dean of, [46](#), [408](#), [414](#); Latin bishops of, [37](#), [414](#), [461](#), [466](#)
- Dauphiné, [195](#), [196](#), [204](#), 208n, [211](#), and see Viennois

- David, Dominican friar (*fl.* 1274), 115n, [116](#)
- David Comnenus, Byzantine co-ruler of Trebizond 1204–1214: [18](#)
- Davidor, Giovanni, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), 294n
- De la Roche, Burgundian family, 37n, [51](#), [79](#), [405](#), [417](#), [419](#), [428](#), [433](#), [434](#), and *see* Androin, Bonne, Gautier, Guillaume, Guy ([3](#)), Isabelle, Jacques, John, Othon ([3](#)), Pierre, Ponce, Sibylle, and William ([2](#)) de la Roche Dematra, [433](#)
- Demetrias, [60](#), [82](#), [424](#), [425](#)
- Demetrius, Latin archbishop of Corfu (*ca.* 1300), 151n
- Demetrius, son of Boniface I of Montferrat and Margaret; lord of Thessalonica 1207–1209, king 1209–1224 (d. 1227), 21n, [27–30](#), [50](#), [51](#), [53](#)
- Demetrius Ducas, son of Theodore; despot of Thessalonica 1244–1246: [61–63](#), [69](#), [70](#)
- Demotica, [16–19](#), [52](#), [73](#), [213](#), [215](#), [300](#)
- Deschamps, Eustache, French chronicler (*fl.* 1390), [340](#)
- Deslaur, Roger, lord of Salona (from 1311), [451](#); wife of, [451](#)
- Devol (Diabolis), [85](#), [86](#)
- Dexart, Antonio, *see* A. Blasi
- Dibra, [74](#)
- Dieudonné de Gozon, master of the Hospitallers 1346–1353: [203](#), [206](#), [207](#), [209](#), [210](#), [212](#), [214](#), [216–218](#), [220–223](#), [229n](#)
- Dijon, [344](#), [346](#), [347](#), [360](#), 362n, [365](#), [366](#)
- Dionysius the Areopagite, bishop of Athens (1st century, canonized), body of, [38](#), [39](#); monastery of, [408](#)
- Divan Gate (Bāb ad-Diḡān, “Porte de la Douane,” Customs-house Gate, in Alexandria), [269](#), [270](#)
- Dobruja, [341](#)
- Dolfin, Giovanni, doge of Venice 1356–1361: 227n, 228n, [229](#), 234n, [235](#), [240](#), [404](#)
- Dolfin, Orso, archbishop of Crete 1349–1361, captain of Smyrna 1356–1359, patriarch of Grado 1361–1367: [234](#), 244n
- Domenico, Gian (of Gubbio), Dominican (*fl.* 1394), [343](#)
- Domenico de Alamania (“Dominique d’Allemagne”), Italian Hospitaller, admiral (in 1402), [364–366](#)
- Domenico di Campofregoso, doge of Genoa 1371–1378: [327](#), [460](#)
- Dominicans, order, [66](#), 80n, [115](#), [126](#), 139n, [163](#), 166n, [193](#), [197](#), [199](#), 200n, [210](#), [211](#), 212n, [224](#), [307](#), [327](#), [398](#), [470](#), and *see* T. Aquinas, Constantine, G. Conti, David, G. Domenico, Ferrer d’Abella, Giovanni de Montelupone, Guy d’Ibelin, Humbert of Romans, James (Petri), Jean de Verceil, F. Pipino, Ptolemy of Lucca, L. Tacconi, Venturino da Bergamo, Vincent of Beauvais, William of Moerbeke; *see also* Humbert II (of Viennois), Innocent V
- Domokos, [439](#), [442](#), [451](#)
- Don, river, [61](#)
- Donato di Ca da Porto, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Donzani, Donzani, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), 295n
- Donzy, [368](#)
- Doro, Maria, sister of Marino Dandolo (*fl.* 1233), [429](#), [430](#)
- Dorotheus, Orthodox archbishop of Monemvasia (17th century), [82](#)
- Dorotheus, Orthodox metropolitan of Athens (to 1392), [471](#)
- Douay, Oudot, Burgundian official (*fl.* 1397), 362n, [365](#), [366](#)
- Doubs, river, [293](#), [405](#)
- Doxapatres, Nilos, Byzantine author (*fl.* 1142), [462](#), [463](#)
- Dragonet de Joyeuse, Hospitaller (*fl.* 1348), 214n, [216](#)
- Dragonet de Montdragon, Hospitaller marshal (in 1366), [275](#)
- Dreux, *see* Pierre de Dreux
- Drin (Drilon), river, [45](#), [74](#)
- Dubois, Pierre, French jurist (*fl.* 1308), [109](#), [166](#), [169](#), [174](#)
- Dubrovnik, *see* Ragusa
- Ducaea, Byzantine imperial dynasty, 43n, [64](#), and *see* Alexius V Ducas (Constantinople in 1204), John III (Ducas) Vatatzes (Nicaea 1222–1254), Euphrosyne; rulers of Epirus 1204–1230–1318: 25n, 51n, [63](#), [67](#), [73](#), [89](#), 136n, [143](#), [406](#), [422](#), [424](#), [438](#), [441](#), and *see* Michael I 1204–1215, Theodore 1215–1230, Michael II 1231–*ca.* 1267, Nicephorus I *ca.* 1267–1296, Thomas 1296–1318, Anna, Constantine, Helena, John, Thamar, Theodore; despots of Thessalonica 1225–1246: [61](#), [63](#), [67](#), and *see* Theodore (“emperor”) 1225–1230, Manuel 1230–1237, John 1237–1244, Demetrius 1244–1246, Irene; lords of Neopatra *ca.* 1268–1318: 25n, [143](#), [438](#), [441](#), [442](#), and *see* John I *ca.* 1268–1295, Constantine 1295–1302, John II 1302–1318, Angelus, Helena, Michael
- Ducas, Byzantine historian (*fl.* 1455), [341](#), [358](#), [376](#)
- Ducas, Alexius, Philanthropenus, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1255), [72](#)
- Ducas, Angelus, son of John I (*fl.* 1295), 436n, [438](#)
- Ducas, Constantine, brother of Theodore (of Epirus); despot of Aetolia and Acarnania (in 1230), [45](#), [51](#), [59](#), [60](#)
- Ducas, Michael, son of John I (d. 1307), [438](#)
- Ducas, Theodore, bastard son of Michael II; Epirote commander (d. 1257), [75](#), 83n, 87n
- Dulcigno, [396](#), [404](#)
- Durand, Guillaume I, bishop of Mende (d. 1296), [113](#)
- Durand, Honorat, chaplain to Boucicaud (*fl.* 1397), [362](#)
- Durazzo, [3](#), [8](#), [19](#), [28](#), [35](#), 41n, [44](#), [45](#), [56](#), [73](#), [74](#), [81](#), [86](#), [90](#), [109](#), [119](#), [137](#), 150n, [233](#), [297](#), [307](#), [404](#); dukes of, *see* Angevins; Latin archbishops of, [186](#)
- Dushan (Dušan), *see* Stephen Urosh IV Dushan
- Eastern Christians, *see* Orthodox Christians
- Écry-sur-Aisne (Asfeld), [7](#), [24](#)
- Edward, lord of Beaujeu (in 1343), [188](#), [191](#), [194](#), [214](#); wife of (Marie), [191](#), [194](#)
- Edward I (“Longshanks”), son of Henry III; Plantagenet king of England 1272–1307: [112](#), [128](#), [142](#), [146](#), [147](#)
- Edward II, son of Edward I; Plantagenet king of England 1307–1327: [169](#)
- Edward III, son of Edward II; Plantagenet king of England 1327–1377: [169](#), [174](#), [179](#), [192](#), 193n, 199n, [247](#), [327](#)
- Edward (“the Black Prince”), son of Edward III; Plantagenet heir apparent (d. 1376), [232](#), [293](#)
- Egypt, [3](#), [6](#), [8](#), [9](#), [69](#), [105](#), [106](#), [109](#), [163](#), [167](#), 197n, [234](#), [238](#), 249n, [259](#), [261](#), [262](#), [266](#), [272–276](#), [278–283](#), [286](#), [287](#), 291n, [292](#), 339n, [382](#), [388](#), [389](#); rulers of, *see* Aiyūbids (1169) 1174–1252, Bahārī Mamluks 1250–1390, Burjī Mamluks 1382–1517
- Elassona, [53](#), [87](#)
- Elato, Mount, [439](#)
- Elba, [334](#), [338](#)
- Elbasan (Albanon), [74](#)
- Eleanor (Eleonora) of Aragon, granddaughter of James II; wife of Peter I of Cyprus 1353–1369 (d. 1417), [250](#), [251](#), 262n, [328](#), [382](#)
- Eleanor, daughter of Peter II of Sicily; wife of Pedro IV of Aragon-Catalonia 1349–1374: [460](#)
- Eleusis, [408](#), [440](#)
- Elis, [24](#), [25](#), [30](#), [127](#), [153](#), 162n
- Elizabeth (of Chappes), wife of Geoffrey I of Villehardouin 1210–1218: [49](#)
- Elizabeth of Poland, sister of Casimir III; mother of Louis I of Hungary (d. 1380), 289n
- Ellada (Spercheus), river, [423](#), [439](#), [440](#)

- Eltham, [374](#)
- Emanuel (of Famagusta), archbishop of Rhodes 1361–1365: [247](#)
- Emanuele da Ca Marino, “patriarch” (d. 1345), [192n](#), [193n](#)
- Embrun, archbishop of, *see* Bertrand de Déaux
- Emeric [1](#), Árpád king of Hungary 1196–1204: [8](#), [16](#)
- Emilia, [172](#)
- Emo, Pietro, Venetian envoy (in 1383), [324](#)
- Enghien, family, [460](#), *and see* Guy, John, *and* Louis d’Enghien
- England, [96](#), [110n](#), [113](#), [146](#), [169](#), [173](#), [174](#), [182](#), [189](#), [193](#), [204](#), [209](#), [214](#), [218](#), [220](#), [224](#), [231](#), [232](#), [245](#), [249](#), [274n](#), [327](#), [329](#), [332](#), [342–344](#), [358](#), [369](#), [373–375](#), [376n](#), [403](#), [414](#); crusaders from, [332](#), [333](#), [335](#), [338](#), [367](#); kings of, *see* Plantagenets (1154–1485)
- English, [112](#), [169](#), [189](#), [193n](#), [204](#), [231](#), [236](#), [238](#), [248](#), [253](#), [254n](#), [261](#), [273](#), [274n](#), [327](#), [331](#), [337](#), [340](#), [343](#), [398](#), [402](#), *and see* England, crusaders from
- Enguerrand VII, count of Coucy (d. 1397), [335](#), [340](#), [345](#), [347](#), [349](#), [350n](#), [353–355](#), [359](#), [360](#), [362](#), [365](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle of Lorraine
- Enveri, Turkish chronicler (*fl.* 1465), [181n](#), [192](#), [211](#)
- Ephesus (Altoluogo, Ayasuluk), [94](#), [201](#), [207](#), [222](#), [290](#), [360n](#); emirs of, *see* Khidr (Beg), Isa; Orthodox metropolitans of, [310n](#), *and see* G. Tornikes, N. Mesarites; titular Latin archbishops of, [217](#)
- Ephraem, Greek chronicler (*fl.* 1313), [22n](#), [54n](#)
- Epirus, [18](#), [25](#), [33](#), [35](#), [67](#), [81](#), [82n](#), [85](#), [87](#), [90](#), [112](#), [143](#), [150](#), [415](#), [438](#), [451](#); despotate of, [25n](#), [29](#), [36](#), [43](#), [60](#), [63](#), [68](#), [76](#), [82](#), [85](#), [90](#), [104](#), [143](#), [422](#), [439](#), [452](#); rulers of, *see* Ducae 1204–1318, John II Orsini 1323–1335
- Érard III le Maure, son of Étienne and Agnes; lord of Arcadia (d. 1387?), [157](#)
- Erminio, Raffo, Genoese noble (*fl.* 1351), [222](#)
- Ermocastro, [414n](#)
- Erymanthus, Mount, [127](#)
- “Esedin Balaban,” Turkish envoy (in 1348), [217](#), [218](#)
- Estensi, ruling family at Ferrara 1208–1597: [170](#), [172](#), [243](#), *and see* Obizzo III and Niccolò II d’Este
- Étienne, count (?) of Burgundy (*fl.* 1170), [405](#)
- Étienne de Batuto, canon of Agen (*ca.* 1352), [263](#)
- Étienne de la Baume, Savoyard admiral (in 1366), [293](#)
- Étienne le Maure (*fl.* 1330), [157](#); wife of, *see* Agnes of Aulnay
- Eu, count of, *see* Philippe d’Artois
- Euboea (Negroponte), [9](#), [18](#), [19](#), [24n](#), [28n](#), [35](#), [36](#), [53](#), [77–80](#), [86](#), [113](#), [129n](#), [131](#), [143](#), [144](#), [145n](#), [155](#), [181](#), [182](#), [185n](#), [190](#), [216](#), [286](#), [297](#), [298](#), [326](#), [371n](#), [377](#), [405](#), [407n](#), [408n](#), [411](#), [415](#), [418](#), [425–427](#), [433](#), [448](#), [462](#), [463](#), [471](#), [472](#); lords of, *see* Jacques d’Avesnes, Ravano dalle Carceri; triarchs of, [31](#), [35n](#), [60](#), [68](#), [77–80](#), [92n](#), [417](#), [420n](#), [424](#), [425](#), [449](#), [451](#), *and see* Guglielmo I, Giberto I and II, Boniface, *and* Beatrice of Verona; Dalle Carceri family; Bartolommeo II and Giorgio II Ghisi; *and* Jean de Noyer de Maisy; Venetians of, [79](#), [424](#), *and see* Negroponte
- Eudocia, daughter of Alexius III Angelus; wife of Alexius V Ducas 1202–1204, wife of L. Sgourus 1204–1207: [22](#)
- Eudocia, daughter of Theodore II Lascaris and Helena (*fl.* 1258), [76](#)
- Eulogia, sister of Michael VIII Palaeologus (*fl.* 1275), [110n](#), [120](#)
- Euphrosyne Ducaena, wife of Alexius III Angelus (to 1203, d. 1215), [22n](#)
- Eurotas, river, [69](#), [82](#), [380](#), [381](#)
- Eustace, brother of Baldwin I (*fl.* 1209), [35](#); wife of, [35](#)
- Eustace of Illsua, palatine of Hungary (*fl.* 1397), [364](#)
- Évreux, *see* Philip III of Évreux; bishop of (R. Grosparmy), [107n](#)
- Fabri de Annoniaco, Peter, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Neopatras 1361–*ca.* 1369: [465](#)
- Fadrique, Alfonso, bastard son of Frederick II of Sicily; vicar-general of duchy of Athens 1317–*ca.* 1330, lord of Salona, count of Malta and Gozo 1330–*ca.* 1338: [156n](#), [442](#), [444](#), [445](#), [448–451](#), [453](#), [454](#), [458](#), [466n](#); wife of, *see* Marulla (of Verona)
- Fadrique, Boniface, son of Alfonso and Marulla; lord of Carystus (d. *ca.* 1380), [454](#)
- Fadrique, James, son of Alfonso and Marulla; lord of Salona (d. by 1366), [453](#), [454](#)
- Fadrique, John, son of Alfonso and Marulla; lord of Aegina (in 1350), [454](#); wife of, *see* Marulla Zaccaria
- Fadrique, Luis, son of James; vicar-general of Athens 1375–1381 (d. 1382), [466n](#), [467n](#)
- Fadrique, Pedro I, son of Alfonso and Marulla; lord of Salona *ca.* 1338–*ca.* 1352 (d. by 1355), [453](#), [454](#)
- Fadrique, William, son of Alfonso and Marulla; lord of Stiris (*fl.* 1366), [444](#)
- Faenza, [172](#), [231](#)
- Faidit, Gaucelm, troubador (d. *ca.* 1220), [7](#)
- Falconaria, battle of (1299), [152](#)
- Falier, Luca, Venetian consul (in 1403), [401](#), [402](#)
- Falier, Marino, doge of Venice 1354–1355: [229](#)
- Famagusta, [229](#), [238](#), [240](#), [241](#), [259](#), [260](#), [266](#), [272](#), [273](#), [278–280](#), [282](#), [322](#), [378](#), [382](#), [383](#), [386–388](#), [390](#), [393](#), [394](#)
- Faraj, an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn, son of Barkuk; Burjī Mamluk soldan of Egypt and Syria 1399–1405, [1406–1412](#): [385](#), [388](#), [394](#)
- Fauquembergue, Flemish family, [418n](#)
- Felisa, wife of Marino Dandolo (to 1233), wife of Jacopo Querini (in 1244), [429–431](#)
- Felisa, daughter of Guglielmo I da Verona; wife of Narzotto dalle Carceri (to 1264), wife (?) of Licario, [78](#), [425](#), [426](#)
- Feltre, [396](#); bishop of, *see* J. Zeno
- Ferdinand, grandson of James I of Aragon-Catalonia; infante of Majorca, claimant to Achaea 1315–1316: [153](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle de Sabran
- Ferdinand de Zaguda, Catalan (*fl.* 1361), [445n](#)
- Ferentino, [50n](#); bishop of, [126](#) (Giacomo, by 1255–1298)
- Ferlay, Guiot, crusader (in 1366), [303](#)
- Ferlino d’Airasca, Hospitaller admiral (in 1365), [268n](#), [269n](#), [273](#)
- Fermo, bishop of, *see* Bongiovanni
- Fernández de Heredia, Garcias, archbishop of Saragossa [1383–1411](#): [373](#)
- Fernández de Heredia, Juan, Hospitaller prior of Castile and León, captain-general of Comtat-Venaissin, grand master of the Hospitallers 1377–1396: [161](#), [230](#), [233](#), [285](#), [327](#)
- Ferrara, [170](#), [172](#), [199](#), [210n](#), [243](#), [279](#), [308n](#), [379n](#); Council of (1438–1439), [132](#); lords of, *see* Estensi
- Ferrer d’Abella, Dominican; Latin bishop of Neopatras (1323) 1328–1330, of Mazzara 1330–1334, of Barcelona 1334–1344: [464](#), [465](#)
- Fez (Fās), [330](#)
- Fidenzio of Padua, Franciscan propagandist (*fl.* 1291), [109](#), [174](#)
- Fieschi, Luca, cardinal 1300–1336: [151](#)
- Fieschi, Ottobono and Sinibaldo, *see* Hadrian V, Innocent IV
- Fifth Crusade (1217–1221), [44](#), [54](#)
- Filippo da Perugia, Franciscan (*fl.* 1278), [129–132](#)
- Filla, [427](#)

- First Crusade (1096–1099), [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [121](#), [122](#), [157](#), [163](#), [234](#), [433](#)
- Flanders, [63](#), [173](#), [331](#), [339](#), [368](#), [401](#), [402](#); countesses of, *see* Jeanne 1206–1244, Margaret 1384–1405; counts of, *see* Baldwin IX (I of Constantinople) 1194–1205, Louis II 1346–1384, Philip (II of Burgundy) 1384–1404; crusaders from, [21](#), [333](#); galleys to, [392](#), [393](#), [402](#); governor of, *see* Gilbert of Leuwerghem; house of, [405](#)
- Florence (Firenze), [111n](#), [154](#), [160n](#), [161n](#), [188](#), [193](#), [199](#), [242](#), [279](#), [286](#), [308n](#), [379n](#), [397](#), [400](#), [469](#), [470](#), and *see* Taddeo di Firenze; archbishop of, *see* A. Acciajuoli; bankers of, [173](#), [184](#), [185](#), [205](#), [215n](#); Council of (1438–1439), [132](#), [177](#); families from, *see* Acciajuoli, Benedetti; government of, [197](#), [204](#), [241](#), [323](#), [324](#), [327](#), [329](#), [375](#), [396](#); merchants of, [142](#); tyrant of, *see* Gautier (VI) de Brienne 1342–1343
- Florence of Worcester, English chronicler (d. 1118), [147n](#)
- Florent of Hainaut, great-grandson of Baldwin VI (I of Constantinople); prince of Achaia 1289–1297: [143](#), [148](#), [149](#), [151](#), [433–438](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle of Villehardouin
- Florimont de Lesparre, Gascon crusader (in 1365), [278](#), [279](#), [292](#), [293](#), [296n](#), [299](#), [302](#)
- Flotte, Pierre, French councillor (d. 1302), [152](#)
- Foggia, [136](#), [144](#), [200](#)
- Foglia, *see* Phocaea
- Foglietta, Uberto, Genoese historian (d. 1581), [331](#)
- Foix, count of, *see* Gaston III
- Fondi, [463n](#)
- Forcalquier, [128](#), [152](#); seneschal of, [190](#), [285](#)
- Forlì, [172](#), [231](#)
- Foscari, Paolo, Latin archbishop of Patras 1375–ca. 1386: [161](#)
- Foscarini, Giovanni, Venetian envoy (in 1366), [274–276](#)
- Fosco, Michele, grape-grower at Coron (*fl.* 1366), [297](#)
- Foscolo, Francesco, Venetian envoy (in 1390), [380](#)
- Fossanuova, abbey, [112](#)
- Foulques de Villaret, master of the Hospitallers 1305–1319 (d. 1327), [447](#)
- Fountain monastery (at Constantinople), [93](#)
- Fourth Crusade (1202–1204), [1–19](#), [24](#), [33](#), [36n](#), [38](#), [39](#), [41–43](#), [48](#), [49](#), [59n](#), [94n](#), [97](#), [98](#), [157](#), [158](#), [239n](#), [400](#), [405](#), [409](#), [411](#), [413](#), [428](#), [432](#), [462](#), [463](#), [466](#)
- France, constables of, *see* Gaucher de Châtillon, Gautier (VI) de Brienne, Philippe d'Artois; crusaders from, [7](#), [21](#), [51](#), [98](#), [103](#), [108](#), [207](#), [261](#), [271](#), [273](#), [332](#), [333](#), [337](#), [338](#), [340](#), [345–356](#), [359](#), [368](#), [404](#); kings of, [2](#), [38](#), [184](#), [213](#), [332](#), and *see* Capetians; knights from, [56](#), [66](#), [87](#), [251](#), [275](#), [362](#), [452](#); mint of, [69](#); queen of, *see* Blanche of Castile; soldiers from, [140](#)
- Francesc of Catalonia, interpreter (*fl.* 1366), [305](#)
- Francesco da Carrara, Italian commander (in 1366), [290](#), [293](#), [322](#), [329](#), [403](#)
- Francesco da Verona, son of Giberto I (*fl.* 1271), [424](#), [434n](#), [439](#)
- Francesco di Cola, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), [294n](#), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Franche-Comté, [293](#), [417](#), [418](#), and *see* Burgundy, county; governor of, *see* Jean de Vergy
- Francis I, Capetian king of France 1515–1547: [375n](#)
- Francis, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Athens in 1365: [463](#)
- Francis, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Neopatras 1369?–1376: [460](#), [465](#)
- Francis, Latin “archbishop” (?) of Smyrna (in 1351), [222](#)
- Franciscans (Friars Minor, Minorites), [56n](#), [93n](#), [96](#), [111](#), [112](#), [118](#), [124](#), [125](#), [133](#), [172](#), [193](#), [196](#), [197](#), [282](#), [297](#), [307](#), [308](#), [360](#), [404](#), [452](#), and *see* Andrea da Perugia, Angelo d'Orvieto, A. Ballester, Bartolommeo da Siena, G. Boem, Bonagratia of Bergamo, Bonaventura, J. Carmesson, Fidenzio of Padua, Filippo da Perugia, Francis (2), Gerardo da Prato, Giovanni de Piancarpino, John de Montelupone, John of Parma, Matthew, Michael of Cesena, Nicholas IV, J. Parastron, P. Patricelli, Rainerio da Siena, Salimbene of Parma, Thomas, F. Toti, William of Ockham; *see also* Spiritual Franciscans
- François “de Pertuso” (du Pertuis?), Auvergnat knight (*fl.* 1347), [213](#), [215](#)
- Frangipane (Frankopan), ruling family at Veglia (to 1480) and Segna, [404](#)
- Frangipani, Guglielmo, Latin archbishop of Patras 1317–1337, Angevin bailie of Achaia 1329–1331: [158](#), [452](#), [453](#)
- Frangopoulus, George, governor of Thessalonica (in 1213), [30](#)
- “Frankish Tower” (in Athens), [473](#)
- Fraschia, [254](#)
- Frederick III (“the Handsome”), grandson of Rudolph I; Hapsburg duke of Austria 1306–1330: [171](#)
- Frederick I (“Barbarossa”), Hohenstaufen king of Germany 1152–1155, emperor 1155–1190: [4](#), [6](#), [59n](#)
- Frederick II, son of Henry VI and Constance; Hohenstaufen king (I) of Sicily 1197–1250, of Germany 1212–1220, emperor 1220–1250, king of Jerusalem 1225–1228: [4](#), [7](#), [44](#), [50n](#), [53](#), [54n](#), [55](#), [58](#), [59](#), [62](#), [64](#), [70](#), [82n](#), [83](#), [114](#), [141](#), [146](#); wife of, *see* Isabella (of Brienne)
- Frederick II, son of Peter I (Pedro III of Aragon-Catalonia); king of Sicily 1296–1337; [35n](#), [165](#), [170](#), [442](#), [444](#), [445](#), [449](#), [450](#), [453n](#), [467](#)
- Frederick III, son of Peter II; king of Sicily and duke (II) of Athens 1355–1377: [294](#), [330](#), [444](#), [454](#), [456](#), [458–460](#), [466](#)
- Frederick, margrave of Baden (d. 1268), [105](#)
- Freiburg (im Breisgau), [347](#)
- Frescobaldi, Gino, Florentine banker (*fl.* 1284), [142](#)
- Friuli, [258](#), [260n](#), [300n](#), [397](#), [403](#), [404](#)
- Froissart, Jean, French chronicler (d. 1410), [279](#), [331](#), [332](#), [334](#), [335](#), [337](#), [339–341](#), [345](#), [347](#), [348](#), [349n](#), [351](#), [352](#), [354–356](#), [362](#), [364–366](#), [368](#), [400](#), [401](#)
- Fromentes, sire de, crusader (in 1366), [301](#), [303](#), [305](#), [306](#)
- Fūwah, [271](#)
- Gabalas, Leo, lord of Rhodes and the Cyclades (in 1234), [52n](#)
- Gabes (Qābis), [331](#); Gulf of, [330](#), [331](#), [339](#), [340](#)
- Gabriele, Genoese merchant (*fl.* 1366), [304](#)
- Gaeta, bishop of, *see* Antonio de'Aribandi
- Galata, [91](#), [100](#), [382](#), and *see* Tower of Galata; *see also* Pera
- Galcerán de Peralta, captain and castellan of Athens (to 1379), [445](#)
- Galeran d'Ivry, Angevin bailie of Achaia 1278–1280: [127](#), [131](#)
- Galilee, titular princes of, *see* Guy and Hugh of Lusignan
- Gallipoli (Callipolis), [18](#), [52](#), [57](#), [92](#), [164n](#), [181](#), [225](#), [246n](#), [293n](#), [297–300](#), [306–309](#), [311](#), [321](#), [356](#), [376–378](#), [384](#), [441](#); governor of, *see* James of Lucerne
- Gambacorta, Pietro, captain and lord of Pisa 1369–1392: [338](#), [340n](#)
- Gangrené, mistress of Michael II Ducas (*fl.* 1230), [59](#), [60](#), [83n](#)
- Gardiki, [432](#), [442](#), [451](#)
- Gargano, Mount, [90n](#)
- Garin de Châteauneuf, Hospitaller prior of Navarre (in 1345), [194n](#), [203](#), [208–210](#)
- Garinus (Warin), Latin archbishop of Thessalonica 1210–1224: [30](#), [47](#), [50n](#)

- Garsias de Henguy, bishop of Bayonne 1384–1408: [373](#)
- Gascony (Gascogne), [146](#), [147](#), [169](#), [174](#), [232](#), [278](#), [293](#), [467](#)
- Gaspard de Montmayeur, Savoyard crusader (in 1366), [293](#), [298](#), [305](#), [306](#)
- Gaspare de' Pagani, merchant at Pera (*fl.* 1397), [363](#), [368](#)
- Gaston III, count of Foix 1343–1391: [329](#)
- Gatari, Galeazzo and Bartolommeo, Paduan chroniclers (*fl.* 1400), [352](#)
- Gattilusio, Genoese family at Lesbos 1355–1462: [225n](#), [361n](#), [363](#), [368](#), [369](#), [385](#), and *see* Francesco I and II
- Gattilusio, Eugenia, daughter of Francesco II; wife of John VII Palaeologus (m. *ca.* 1396, d. 1440), [363n](#)
- Gattilusio, Francesco I, lord of Lesbos 1355–1384: [225](#), [298](#), [299](#), [302](#), [306](#), [319](#), [324](#), [360n](#), [361](#); wife of, *see* Maria (Palaeologina)
- Gattilusio, Francesco II (born Jacopo), son of Francesco I; lord of Lesbos 1384–1427: [359–361](#), [363](#), [364](#), [368](#); wife of, [363](#)
- Gattilusio, Niccolò, brother of Francesco I; lord of Aenos (*fl.* 1397), [361](#), [363](#), [364](#), [368](#)
- Gattilusio, Oberto, Genoese noble (*fl.* 1351), [222](#)
- Gaucher de Châtillon, constable of France (d. 1328), [447](#), [448](#), [452](#)
- Gautier, Latin archbishop of Corinth (*ca.* 1212), [36](#), [46n](#), [411n](#)
- Gautier I (V) de Brienne, son of Hugh and Isabelle; count of Brienne and Lecce 1296–1311, duke of Athens 1309–1311: [156n](#), [189](#), [441](#), [442n](#), [445–448](#), [452](#), [463](#); wife of, *see* Jeanne de Châtillon
- Gautier II (VI) de Brienne, son of Gautier I and Jeanne; count of Lecce and titular duke of Athens 1311–1356, tyrant of Florence 1342–1343: [156n](#), [184](#), [189](#), [204](#), [206n](#), [444–447](#), [450](#), [452–456](#), [459](#)
- Gautier de Fouchierolles, Briennist lord of Argos and Nauplia 1311–1324: [450](#)
- Gautier de la Roche-Ray, precentor of the Parthenon (in 1292), [417](#), [432](#)
- Gautier de Lor, Angevin bailie of Achaea 1357–1360: [459n](#)
- Gautier de Ray, Latin bishop of Negroponte 1296–1313: [150n](#), [447](#), [463](#)
- Gehenna, [19](#)
- Geneva, [169](#), and *see* Hugh of Geneva; bishop of (William Aleman 1342–1366), [286n](#); church of, [27n](#); counts of, *see* Amadeo III, Aimon III; *see also* Aimon of Geneva-Athon, Blanche of Geneva, Clement VII (Robert of Geneva)
- Genoa, [106](#), [147](#), [190](#), [197](#), [199](#), [203](#), [205–208](#), [243](#), [245](#), [260](#), [273](#), [330](#), [333](#), [334](#), [337–340](#), [344](#), [362](#), [364](#), [370](#), [374](#), [378](#), [379](#), [382](#), [383](#), [387](#), [388](#), [391](#), [393](#), [394n](#), [396–399](#); archbishops of, *see* Jacopo da S. Vittoria, Guido; doges of, [322](#), [398](#), and *see* G. Murta 1344–1350, Giovanni de' Valenti 1350–1353, G. Adorno 1363–1371, Domenico di Campofregoso 1371–1378, N. Guarco 1378–1383, A. Adorno 1384/1396; government of, [197](#), [204](#), [207n](#), [229](#), [258n](#), [261](#), [282](#), [291](#), [379](#), [392](#); governors of, *see* Colart de Calleville, Boucicaut, Gilbert de la Fayette; individuals from, [140](#), [197](#), [225](#), [247](#), [259](#), [304](#), [328](#), [334](#), [363](#), [366](#); republic of, [91n](#), [96n](#), [111](#), [149](#), [154](#), [210n](#), [218](#), [220–222](#), [224](#), [227](#), [231](#), [236n](#), [239n](#), [250](#), [254](#), [259–261](#), [274](#), [279](#), [283](#), [317](#), [322](#), [324](#), [326](#), [327](#), [331](#), [339](#), [340](#), [344](#), [347](#), [369](#), [370](#), [377](#), [382](#), [383](#), [388](#), [389](#), [393](#), [396–400](#), [420](#), [455](#); ships of, [100](#), [106](#), [108](#), [163](#), [191](#), [194n](#), [202](#), [206](#), [261](#), [264](#), [273](#), [282](#), [291](#), [295](#), [297](#), [298](#), [302–304](#), [329–331](#), [333–338](#), [350n](#), [370](#), [371](#), [378](#), [379](#), [383–391](#), [393–395](#)
- Geoffrey of Briel, nephew of William of Villehardouin; lord of Karytaina 1255–1275: [78](#), [80](#), [89](#), [148n](#), [420n](#), [422](#), [432](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle de la Roche
- Geoffrey of Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne, chronicler (d. *ca.* 1213), [4n](#), [6](#), [11](#), [12](#), [16–18](#), [24](#), [28](#), [40n](#), [41](#), [168n](#)
- Geoffrey I of Villehardouin, nephew of Geoffrey; prince of Achaea (1209) 1210–*ca.* 1228: [24](#), [25](#), [28n](#), [30](#), [31](#), [34–37](#), [39](#), [41](#), [46–51](#), [56](#), [57n](#), [63](#), [98](#), [127](#), [405](#), [411n](#), [412](#), [414–417](#), [418n](#); wife of, *see* Elizabeth (of Chappes)
- Geoffrey II of Villehardouin, son of Geoffrey I and Elizabeth; prince of Achaea *ca.* 1228–1246: [31n](#), [49](#), [50](#), [54](#), [56–58](#), [60](#), [63](#), [66](#), [68](#), [127](#); wife of, *see* Agnes of Courtenay
- Geoffroy de Veyrols, archbishop of Toulouse 1361–1376: [262](#), [263](#)
- George, nephew of M. Choniates (*fl.* 1208), [23](#)
- George Comnenus, Byzantine ruler at Trebizond 1266–1280: [129n](#)
- George of Cyprus (Gregory), Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1283–1289: [143n](#)
- George II Xiphilinus, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1191–1198: [4n](#)
- Georgia, [342n](#)
- Gerace, bishops of, *see* Barlaam, Simon Atumano
- Geraki, [31](#), [99n](#), [126](#)
- Gerardo da Prato, Franciscan (*fl.* 1264), [100](#)
- Gerardo (Guerau) de Rodonella, Catalan envoy (in 1380), [468](#)
- German ("Holy Roman") empire, [7](#), [114](#), [170–172](#), [175](#); emperors of, [2](#), [171](#), [313](#), and *see* Otto I (936) 962–973, Frederick I (Hohenstaufen, 1152) 1155–1190, Henry VI (Hohenstaufen, 1169, 1190) 1191–1197, Otto IV (of Brunswick, 1201) 1209–1211, Frederick II (Hohenstaufen, 1212) 1220–1250, Alfonso (X of Castile, 1256–1273), Rudolph I (Hapsburg, 1273–1291), Henry VII (of Luxemburg, 1308) 1312–1313, Ludwig IV (of Bavaria, Wittelsbach, 1314) 1328–1347, Charles IV (of Luxemburg, 1346, 1347) 1355–1378, Wenceslas (of Luxemburg, 1376, 1378–1400), Sigismund (of Luxemburg, 1410) 1433–1437; *see also* Charlemagne (768, 771) 800–814, Louis I 814–840
- Germanus II, Orthodox patriarch at Nicaea 1222–1240: [51](#), [57–59](#), [419](#)
- Germanus III, Orthodox patriarch at Constantinople 1265–1266 (d. after 1274), [114](#), [115](#)
- Germany, [59n](#), [110n](#), [113](#), [152](#), [166n](#), [169](#), [172](#), [209](#), [237](#), [247](#), [249n](#), [251](#), [342](#), [351](#), [462](#); crusaders from, [21](#), [207](#), [261](#), [273](#), [292](#), [346](#), [348](#), [350](#), [351](#), [353–355](#), [367](#); kings of ("the Romans"), *see* German empire; mercenaries from, [85](#), [86](#), [89](#), [254n](#)
- Germiyan, [341](#), [376](#)
- Gervasius, Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1215–1219: [46](#), [47](#)
- Gesta Innocentii*, author of, [6](#), [7](#)
- Geyme, Martin, Marseillais skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Ghent, [366](#), [401](#), [402](#), and *see* John of Gaunt
- Ghibellines, [4](#), [7](#), [44](#), [45n](#), [111](#), [138](#), [139](#), [141](#), [143](#), [163](#), [170](#), [172](#), [207](#)
- Ghisi, Venetian family at Tenos 1207–1390: [19n](#), [155](#), [156n](#), [157](#), and *see* Andrea, Bartolommeo I and II, and Giorgio II Ghisi
- Ghisi, Agnese, sister of Andrea; wife of Othon de Cicon (to *ca.* 1264), lady of Carystus, [80n](#), [418](#), [426n](#)
- Ghisi, Andrea, lord of Tenos and Mykonos 1207–d. after 1259: [19n](#), [80n](#), [418](#), [426](#), [429–431](#), [433n](#)
- Ghisi, Bartolommeo I, son of Andrea; lord of Tenos and Mykonos (in 1290), [144](#), [433n](#)

- Ghisi, Bartolommeo II, grandson of Bartolommeo I; lord of Tenos and Mykonos, triarch of Euboea 1311–1341: [156](#), [157](#), [451](#)
- Ghisi, Filippo, lord of Skopelos (d. by 1284), [426](#); wife of, *see* Isabetta Ghisi
- Ghisi, Geremia, brother of Andrea; lord of Skiathos, Skopelos, and Skyros (d. 1251), 19n, 80n, [418](#), [426](#), [429–431](#)
- Ghisi, Giorgio II, son of Bartolommeo II; lord of half Thebes 1327–1341, of Tenos and Mykonos and triarch of Euboea 1341–ca. 1352: 156n, [188](#); wife of, *see* Simona of Aragon
- Ghisi, Isabetta, daughter of Geremia; wife of Filippo Ghisi (*fl.* 1250), [426](#)
- Ghisi, Marino, Venetian agent (*fl.* 1259), [431](#)
- Giacomo and Giovanni de' Pepoli, sons of Taddeo (*fl.* 1345), [199](#), 200n
- Giberto I da Verona, triarch of Euboea 1205–1208: 434n
- Giberto II da Verona, son of Guglielmo I; triarch of Euboea 1275–1279: [424–427](#)
- Gibraltar, Strait of, [339](#)
- Gil de Albornoz, cardinal 1350–1367: [173](#), 177n, [231](#), [243](#), [246](#), 247n, [255](#)
- Gilbert de la Fayette, French governor of Genoa (in 1406), [396](#)
- Gilbert of Leuwerghem, governor of Flanders (d. 1397), [360](#), [362](#), [363](#)
- Giorgio (Zorzi), Fantino, Venetian commander (in 1382), [324](#)
- Giorgio (Zorzi), Niccolò I, marquis (margrave) of Boudonitza 1335–1345 (d. 1354), [202](#); wife of, *see* Guglielma Pallavicini
- Giovanetti, Matteo, Italian painter (*fl.* 1353), [176](#), [224](#)
- Giovanni II, grandson of Andronicus II Palaeologus and Yolanda; marquis of Montferrat 1330–1372: 229n, [233](#)
- Giovanni da Procida, Italian diplomat (*fl.* 1279), [138](#)
- Giovanni dalle Carceri, son of Pietro and Balzana; double-triarch of Euboea 1340–1358: [188](#); wife of, *see* Fiorenza Sanudo
- Giovanni de Montelupone, Dominican; Latin bishop of Lepanto 1393–1396: [342](#)
- Giovanni de Piancarpino (John de Plano Carpini), Franciscan missionary (d. 1252), [97](#)
- Giovanni de' Valenti, doge of Genoa 1350–1353: [222](#)
- Giovanni di Conte, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), 294n, 295n, [297](#), [302](#), [307n](#)
- Giovanni di Conversino “da Ravenna,” Italian scholar (d. 1408), [300](#)
- Giovanni di Jacopo Malpaghini da Ravenna, secretary of Petrarch 1364–1368: 300n
- Giovanni di Magnari, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), 295n, [302](#)
- Giraldus Cambrensis, bishop of S. David's 1199–1203 (d. 1220?), [409](#)
- Girard de Grandmont, crusader (in 1366), [305](#)
- Giustinian, Giustiniano, Venetian envoy (in 1345), [197–200](#), [216](#)
- Giustinian, Marco, Venetian envoy (in 1369), [314](#)
- Giustinian, Niccolò, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1291–1293: [432](#)
- Giustinian, Niccolò, Venetian envoy (in 1368), [281](#)
- Giustinian, Pancrazio, Venetian captain (*fl.* 1347), [210](#)
- Giustinian, Tommaso, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1259–1261: [91](#)
- Glarentza (Cyllene, Clarence), [95](#), 127n, [131](#), [151](#), 153n, [198](#), [200](#), [307](#), [364](#), [441](#), [453](#)
- Godfrey of Bouillon, advocate of the Holy Sepulcher 1099–1100: 32n
- Golden Bull (1356), [172](#), [173](#)
- Golden Horde, 108n; rulers of, *see* Batu 1243–1256, Berke 1257–1266
- Golden Horn (at Constantinople), [5n](#), [10](#), 12n, [91](#), [144](#), [306](#), [382](#)
- Gomez de Barroso, Pedro, cardinal 1327–1348: [184](#), 185n
- Gondola, Giovanni, Ragusan chronicler (d. 1650), [356](#), 357n
- Gonzaga, Lodovico (Luigi), lord of Mantua 1328–1360: [172](#), 210n
- Gozo, count of, [451](#)
- Gozzadini, Balzana, wife of Pietro dalle Carceri (to 1340), regent of two “thirds” of Euboea (after 1340), [188](#)
- Gradenigo, Venetian family in Crete, [249](#), [255](#)
- Gradenigo, Bartolommeo (Bertuccio), doge of Venice 1339–1342: [183](#), [185](#)
- Gradenigo, Giovanni, doge of Venice 1355–1356: [230](#)
- Gradenigo, Marco (“the Elder”), rebel governor of Crete (d. 1364), [250](#), [254](#)
- Gradenigo, Marco, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1256–1258, podestà at Constantinople 1258–1261: [78–80](#), [92](#)
- Gradenigo, Paolo, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1254–1256: [78](#)
- Gradenigo, Pietro, doge of Venice 1289–1311: 35n, [163](#), [165](#), [167](#), [168](#)
- Gradenigo, Pietro, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1362–1364: 250n
- Grado, [248](#), [258](#), [343](#); patriarchs of, 192n, *and see* Angelo, O. Dolfin
- Gran (Esztergom), [258](#), [288](#), [367](#); archbishops of, *see* Nicholas, John de Kanizsa
- Granada, kingdom of, 166n, 168n, [170](#), [330](#), 446n; rulers of, *see* Nasrids (1232–1492)
- Grand Canal (in Venice), [49](#), [242](#), [260](#), [278](#), [281](#), [372](#), [403](#)
- Grand Karaman (“Gran Caramano”), [240](#)
- Grand Magne (Maina), [68](#), [98](#), 99n, [126](#), 162n, [427](#)
- Grandson, *see* Guillaume de Grandson
- Grapella dalle Carceri, son-in-law of Guglielmo I da Verona; triarch of Euboea (d. ca. 1264), [81n](#), [83](#), [95](#)
- Grasso, John (“Idruntinus”), Ghibelline poet (*fl.* 1235), [58](#)
- Gravia, [87](#), [413](#), [424](#), [432](#), [438](#), [439](#); lord of, [413](#)
- Gravina (di Puglia), *see* John of Gravina
- Great Palace (at Constantinople), [93](#), [94](#)
- Greco, Cape, [272](#)
- Greek Orthodox (Byzantine) Church, [2](#), [4](#), [8](#), [11](#), [15](#), 23n, 37n, [42](#), [45](#), [49](#), [58](#), [71](#), [96](#), [101](#), [118](#), [120](#), 128–[134](#), [165](#), [168](#), [225](#), [228](#), [255](#), 280n, [310](#), [311](#), [316](#), [406](#), [425](#), [446](#); of Bulgaria, [59](#), [320](#); of Epirus, [52](#), [76](#); of Russia and the Levant, [320](#); of Serbia, [226](#), [320](#)
- Gregoras, Nicephorus, Byzantine historian (d. 1360), [86](#), 89n, 93n, [102](#), [122](#), [191](#), [215](#), [216](#), 300n, 308n, [310](#), [311](#), [421](#), [423](#), 424n, [427](#), 442n
- Gregory IX (Ugolino de' Conti of Segni, cousin of Innocent III), cardinal 1199–1227, pope 1227–1241: [52](#), [54](#), [55](#), [58–60](#), [63–67](#), [409](#), [419](#), [420](#), [428](#), [429](#), [463](#), [468](#)
- Gregory X (Tadalo Visconti), pope 1271–1276: [105](#), 107–[125](#), [128](#), 133n, [134](#)
- Gregory XI (Pierre Roger de Beaufort, nephew of Clement VI), cardinal 1348–1370, pope 1370–1378: [169](#), [173](#), [176](#), [187](#), [263](#), [327–329](#), [460](#), [465](#)
- Gregory XII (Angelo Correr), cardinal 1405–1406, pope 1406–1415: [397](#)
- Gregory of Pavia, vicar of L. Tacconi (in 1339), [453](#)
- Grenoble, [194](#), [208](#), [210](#), [211](#); bishops of (Rudolph 1350–1380), 286n, *and see* Jean de Chissey
- Grifon of Arezzo, canon of Coron (in 1363), [457](#)
- Grillo, Brancalone, merchant at Pera (*fl.* 1397), [362](#), [364](#)
- Grillo (Grisle), Niccolò, Genoese envoy (in 1397), [363](#)

- Grimaldi, Venetian family in Crete, [249](#)
 Grimani, Marino, Venetian captain (in 1345), [200](#), [201](#)
 Grino, Zanachi, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1405), [326](#)
 Gritti, Venetian family in Crete, [254](#)
 Gritzena, [31](#)
 Grosparmy, Raoul, bishop of Évreux 1259–1261, cardinal 1261–1270: [106](#), [107](#)
 Grosseto, bishop of, *see* Bartolommeo d'Amelia
 Gualfredini, Piero, Venetian notary (in 1403), [401](#), [402n](#)
 Guarco, Niccolò, doge of Genoa 1378–1383: [324](#)
 Guelfs, 86n, [111](#), [134](#), 138n, [143](#), [170](#), [172](#), [207](#), [446](#)
 Guerrici, Lambert, 14th-century Flemish polemicist, [171](#)
 Guglielmo III, marquis of Montferrat 1135–1188: [7](#)
 Guglielmo IV, son of Boniface I; marquis of Montferrat 1207–1225: [27](#), [50](#), [51](#), [53](#), [417](#)
 Guglielmo I da Verona, triarch of Euboea 1216–1263, titular king of Thessalonica 1243–1263: [78–80](#), [83](#), [91](#), [95](#); wife of, *see* Simona
 Guglielmo II da Verona, son of Guglielmo I (d. 1271), [424](#); wife of, *see* Marguerite (de Neuilly)
 Guido, archbishop of Florence 1358–1368: [233](#)
 Guido da Bagnolo di Reggio, physician (*fl.* 1365), [260](#), [261](#), [274](#), [280](#), [281](#)
 Guidotto de Cicon, son of Othon and Agnese (*fl.* 1277), [426n](#)
 Guillaume de Bruniquel, papal vicar-general (from 1310), [170](#)
 Guillaume de Chalamont, of Meximieux and Montanay, Savoyard crusader (in 1366), [293](#), [302](#)
 Guillaume de Grandson of S. Croix, Burgundian crusader (in 1366), [293](#), [299](#), [302–305](#)
 Guillaume de l'Aigle, French envoy (in 1397), [359](#), [360](#)
 Guillaume de la Roche, archbishop-elect of Athens (in 1268), [417](#)
 Guillaume de la Trémoille, marshal of Burgundy (d. 1396), [343](#), [344](#), [354](#), [355](#)
 Guillaume de Machaut, French poet and chronicler (d. 1377), [265–271](#), [275](#), [295](#), [340](#)
 Guillaume de Noellet, papal nuncio (in 1366), [288](#)
 Guillaume de Nogaret, French jurist (d. 1313), [163](#), [169](#), [174](#)
 Guillaume de Plaisians, French propagandist (*fl.* 1306), [169](#)
 Guillaume de Royn, emissary (in 1345), [195](#)
 Guillaume de Tanlay, castellan at Port-de-Jonc (in 1366), [297n](#)
 Guillaume of Champlitte, grandson of Hugh I of Champagne; prince of Achaëa 1205–1209: [16](#), [24–26](#), [28n](#), [30](#), [33](#), [34](#), 156n, [405](#)
 Guillaume of Thurey, archbishop of Lyon 1358–1365: [286n](#)
 Gundulić, Ivan, Serbocroatian chronicler (d. 1638), [357n](#)
 Gunther of Pairis, German chronicler (*fl.* 1205), [18](#), [20](#)
 Guy III, count of S. Pol 1292–1317: [152](#)
 Guy, lord of Ray (*ca.* 1200), [417](#)
 Guy d'Enghien, son of (Gautier and) Isabelle de Brienne; lord of Argos and Nauplia 1356–1377: [459](#), [460n](#)
 Guy d'Ibelin, Dominican; bishop of Limassol 1357–1367: [265](#)
 Guy de Boulogne, cardinal 1342–1373: [220](#), [294](#)
 Guy I de la Roche, nephew of Othon; lord of half Thebes 1211–1225, great lord of Athens 1225–1263: [28n](#), [56n](#), [65](#), [67](#), [68](#), [78–80](#), [83](#), [91](#), [95](#), [99](#), [417–422](#), [427](#), [428](#), [432](#), [433](#)
 Guy II de la Roche, son of William and Helena; duke of Athens 1287–1308, bailie of Achaëa 1307–1308: [149](#), [153](#), [432–441](#), [450](#); wife of, *see* Mahaut of Hainaut
 Guy de la Roche, son of Othon and Isabelle; lord of La Roche (from 1234), [417](#), [418](#)
 Guy de la Trémoille, lord of Sully (d. 1397), [345](#), [351](#), [354](#), [355](#), [360](#), [362](#), [364](#), [368](#)
 Guy de Plailly, bishop of Senlis 1294–1308: [164](#)
 Guy de Pontarlier, marshal of Burgundy (*fl.* 1366), [303](#)
 Guy of Lusignan, son of Hugh IV; titular prince of Galilee (d. 1346), [238n](#); wife of, *see* Marie of Bourbon
 Güyük, son of Ögödei; great khan of the Mongols 1246–1248: [97](#)
 Hadrian V (Ottobono Fieschi), cardinal 1251–1276, pope in 1276: [113](#), [118](#), [125](#), [126n](#)
 Hafšids, Berber rulers of Tunisia and eastern Algeria 1230–1574: [141n](#), [330](#), [331](#), [455n](#), and *see* Muḥammad I 1249–1277, Aḥmad II 1354–1357, 1360–1394, 'Abd-al-'Azīz II 1394–1434
 Hagenau, [7](#)
 Hagia Sophia (or Santa Sophia), cathedral (at Constantinople), [10](#), [12–14](#), [18](#), [40n](#), [121](#), [129](#), [189](#), [429](#); (at Nicosia), [237n](#), [265n](#)
 Hagiotheodorites, Nicholas, Orthodox metropolitan of Athens (in 1160), [22n](#)
 Hainaut (Hainault, Henegouwen), [153](#); count of, *see* Baldwin VI (I of Constantinople); *see also* Florent and Mahaut of Hainaut, Eustace, Henry d'Angre, Yolande
 Halmyros, [22n](#), [53](#), [69n](#), [451n](#); battle of (1311) [189](#), [441](#), [442n](#), [453n](#), [456n](#)
 Hamid, [341](#), [376](#)
 Hapsburgs, [2](#); dynasty in Austria 1282–1780, *see* Frederick III 1306–1330, Rudolph IV 1358–1365, Albert III 1365–1395, Leopold IV 1395–1404; in Germany, *see* Rudolph I 1273–1291; in Spain, *see* Philip II 1556–1598, John of Austria
 Hauteville, lord of, *see* Aymar de Clermont
 Hayton (Heṭoum), Armenian historian (d. after 1307), [174](#)
 Helena, daughter of John VI Cantacuzenus; wife of John V Palaeologus 1347–1391 (d. 1396), [301](#), [310n](#)
 Helena, daughter of Michael II Ducas and Theodora; wife of Manfred of Sicily 1259–1266 (d. 1271), [81](#), [82](#), [83n](#), [86](#), [104](#)
 Helena (Dragaš), wife of Manuel II Palaeologus *ca.* 1393–1425 (d. 1450), [371](#), [380](#), [381](#), [384](#)
 Helena, daughter of John Asen II; wife of Theodore II Lascaris 1235–1237: [55](#), [57n](#)
 Helena, daughter of John I Ducas; wife of William de la Roche *ca.* 1275–1287, regent of Athens 1287–1296, wife of Hugh de Brienne 1291–1296 (d. after 1299), [149](#), [423](#), [424](#), [427](#), [432–435](#), [436n](#), [438](#)
 Hélon de Villeneuve, master of the Hospitallers 1319–1346: [180](#), [181](#), [183](#), [185](#), [186](#), [188](#), [191](#), [193](#), [194](#), [203](#)
 Hellespont, *see* Dardanelles
 Helos, [37n](#), [38](#)
 Henri de Bar, son of Robert; French crusader (d. 1397), [345](#), [347](#), [354](#), [355](#), [359](#), [361](#), [363–365](#)
 Henri de Valenciennes, French chronicler (*fl.* 1215), [28](#), [35](#), [40n](#), [411n](#)
 Henri I de Villars, archbishop of Lyon 1295–1301: [152](#)
 Henri II de Villars, archbishop of Lyon 1342–1356: [195n](#), [204](#), [205n](#), [208n](#), [210](#)
 Henry VI, son of Frederick I; Hohenstaufen king of Germany 1169–1190, emperor (1190) 1191–1197, king of Sicily 1194–1197: [4](#), [6](#), [7](#); wife of, *see* Constance
 Henry III, king of Castile and León 1390–1406: [373n](#)
 Henry VII, of Luxemburg, king of Germany 1308–1312, emperor 1312–1313: [170–172](#)
 Henry, Latin archbishop of Athens (in 1305), [151](#), [461n](#)

- Henry III, son of John; Plantagenet king of England 1216–1272: 110n
- Henry IV ("Bolingbroke"), son of John of Gaunt; Plantagenet king of England 1399–1413: [373](#), [374](#)
- Henry d'Angre of Hainaut, brother of Baldwin I; regent 1205–1206, Latin emperor of Constantinople 1206–1216: 18n, [20](#), 21n, [27–29](#), [34](#), [35](#), [39](#), 40n, [42–44](#), [46](#), 50n, [54](#), [65](#), [68](#), [95](#), [405](#), [406](#), 411n; wives of, *see* Agnes of Montferrat, Maria
- Henry d'Asti, titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1339–1345: [183](#), [186](#), [188](#), [189](#), [191](#), [192](#), [194](#), 206n, [212](#), [217](#), [455](#)
- Henry I of Louvain, duke of Brabant 1190–1235: 10n
- Henry I of Lusignan, king of Cyprus 1218–1253: [243](#), [260](#)
- Heraclea (in Pontus; Ereghli), [18](#), [101](#); Orthodox bishops of, 310n, *and see* Leo
- Heraclea (in Thrace), [18](#), [321](#)
- Heredia, *see* Fernández de Heredia
- Hermann II, count of Cilly (d. 1435), [356](#)
- Hermann of Schildesche, Westphalian canonist (d. 1357), [171](#)
- Hermione, [23](#)
- Hetoumids, royal dynasty in Cilician Armenia 1226–1342, 1365–1373, *see* Leon III 1269–1289, Hayton (Hetoum)
- Heugeville, lord of, *see* Jean de Hangest
- Hodegetria, monastery (at Constantinople), [94](#)
- Hohenstaufen, imperial dynasty in Germany and Italy [1138–1268](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#), [59](#), [65](#), 101, 103n, [105](#), [138](#), [141](#), [446](#), *and see* Frederick I (1152) 1155–1190, Henry VI (1169, 1190) 1191–1197, Frederick II (1212) 1220–1250, Philip (Swabia 1196–1208), Conradin (Jerusalem 1254–1268, Sicily 1254–1258), Manfred (Sicily 1258–1266), Constance ([2](#))
- Holobolus, Manuel, Byzantine rhetorician (*fl.* 1265), 77n, [101](#)
- Holt, Peter, Hospitaller prior of Ireland (in 1401), [374](#)
- Holy Roman empire, *see* German empire
- Holy Sepulcher, church (at Jerusalem), 167n, [174](#), [197](#), [209](#), [224](#), [229](#), [242](#), [283](#), [345](#); advocate of, *see* Godfrey of Bouillon
- Honorius III (Cencio Savelli), cardinal 1192–1216, pope 1216–1227: [39](#), [41](#), [44–51](#), [65](#), [66](#), 408n, 410n, 411n, [414–417](#), [419](#), [463](#)
- Honorius IV (Jacopo Savelli), cardinal 1261–1285, pope 1285–1287: [144](#), [146](#), [147](#)
- Horaia, daughter of R. Logaras; Greek litigant (in 1213), [29](#), [30](#), [51](#)
- Hospitallers, or Knights Hospitallers of S. John of Jerusalem, military order, 66n, [113](#), [159](#), [161](#), [165](#), [166](#), [169](#), [170](#), 179n, [180](#), [183](#), [185](#), [186](#), 188n, 190n, [191](#), [195](#), [196](#), [198](#), [202](#), [203](#), [205](#), [206](#), [208](#), [211](#), 214n, [217–224](#), [227](#), [229–231](#), [236](#), [240](#), 255n, 258n, [264](#), [265](#), [275](#), [276](#), [280](#), [281](#), [283](#), [285](#), 319n, [327](#), [328](#), [341](#), [346](#), [364](#), [447](#), [448](#), [451n](#), [459](#); in Greece, [38](#), 64n, [158](#), [161](#), [162](#), [378](#), [412](#); masters and grand masters of, Foulques de Villaret 1305–1319, Hélion de Villeneuve 1319–1346, Dieudonné de Gozon 1346–1353, Pierre de Corneillan 1353–1355, Roger des Pins 1355–1365, Raymond Bérenger 1365–1374, Juan Fernández de Heredia 1377–1396, Philibert de Naillac 1396–1421; admirals of, *see* Domenico de Alamania, Ferlino d'Airasca; marshal of, *see* Dragonet de Montdragon; preceptor of, *see* N. Benedetti; priors of, [275](#), *and see* J. Fernández de Heredia, Garin de Châteauneuf, P. Holt, Isnard de Albaro, John of Biandrate, Raymond de Lescure
- Hugh I, count of Champagne 1089–d. after 1125: [24](#)
- Hugh IV, count of S. Pol 1174–1205: 10n, [13](#)
- Hugh IV, son of Odo III; duke of Burgundy 1218–1273, titular king of Thessalonica 1266–1273: 53n, [69](#), [422](#)
- Hugh de Brienne, great-nephew of John; count of Brienne and Lecce 1250–1296, bailie of Athens 1291–1296: 148n, [422](#), [432](#), [434–436](#); wives of, *see* Isabelle de la Roche, Helena (Ducaena)
- Hugh le Rousseau de Sully, Angevin vicar of Albania 1279–1281: [136](#), [137](#)
- Hugh (Hugues) of Chalon, lord of Arlay (*fl.* 1366), [292](#), [293](#), 294n, 295n, [299](#), [302](#); wife of, *see* Blanche of Geneva
- Hugh of Champlitte, nephew of Guillaume (d. 1209), [34](#)
- Hugh of Coligny, French crusader (in 1204), [16](#)
- Hugh of Geneva (*fl.* 1345), [199](#), [204](#), [209](#)
- Hugh of Lapalisse, Burgundian knight (*fl.* 1320), [153](#); wife of, *see* Mahaut of Hainaut
- Hugh III of Lusignan, nephew of Henry I; king of Cyprus 1267–1284, of Jerusalem 1269–1284: 115n
- Hugh IV of Lusignan, grandson of Hugh III; king of Cyprus 1324–1359: 182n, [183](#), [185](#), [188](#), [190](#), [201](#), [206](#), [217–222](#), 224n, [227](#), [229–231](#), 234n, [235](#), [237](#), 238n, 244n
- Hugh of Lusignan, son of Guy and Marie; claimant to Achaea 1364–1370, titular prince of Galilee (d. 1379), [237](#), 238n, [243](#), [244](#), 265n, [297](#)
- Hugo, archdeacon of Daulia (in 1212), [413](#)
- Hugo de Scuria, archbishop of Ragusa 1361–1370: [289](#)
- Hulagu (Hülegü), brother of Möngke; il-khan of Persia 1258–1265: [97](#), [98](#), [106](#), [115](#), [116](#), [120](#)
- Humbert II, dauphin of Viennois 1333–1349, titular patriarch of Alexandria 1351–1355: [191](#), [194–214](#), [218](#), [456](#); wife of, *see* Marie des Baux
- Humbert of Romans, Dominican general 1254–1263 (d. 1277), [109](#)
- Hundred Years' War (1337–1453), [160](#), [173](#), [174](#), [182](#), [204](#)
- Hungary, [50](#), 61n, 97n, 110n, [200](#), [258](#), [287–290](#), [328](#), [341](#), [343](#), [345](#), [346](#), 349n, [367](#); armies of, [160](#), [322](#), [323](#), [344](#); crusaders from, [346](#), [348](#), [350](#), [351](#), [353–356](#), [367](#); kingdom of, [142](#), [195](#), [198](#), [199](#), [218](#), [227](#), [228](#), [231](#), [237](#), [247n](#), [248](#), 251n, [259](#), [287–290](#), [297](#), [322](#), [342](#), [343](#), [357](#), [364](#), [400–404](#); kings of, *see* (Árpád line) Emeric I 1196–1204, Bela IV 1235–1270, Stephen V 1270–1272, Anna, Margaret, (Angevin line) Louis I 1342–1382, Charles III of Durazzo 1385–1386, Andrew, Stephen, (Luxemburg line) Sigismund 1385–1437; mercenaries from, [85](#), 254n; people of, [60](#), 96n, [109](#), [341](#), [343](#)
- Huy, [171](#)
- Hymettus, Mount, [65](#), [419](#)
- Hypate, *see* Neopatras
- Ianina (Janina, Ioannina), [86](#), [89](#), [90](#), [439](#)
- Ibn-'Arrām, Khalīl, governor of Alexandria (in 1365), [267](#), [270](#)
- Ibn-Khaldūn, Abū-Zaid 'Abd-ar-Rahmān, Arabic historian (d. 1406), [330](#), [336](#), [339](#)
- Icaria, [52](#)
- Iconium (Konya), sultanate of, [61](#), [74](#); sultans of, *see* Seljuks 1071–1302
- Ierissos, Orthodox bishop of (in 1213), [30](#)
- Ignatian controversy, [1](#)
- Il-khans, Mongol dynasty in Persia 1258–1349: [115](#), [116](#), [118](#), [133](#), [146](#), [147](#), [266](#), *and see* Hulagu 1258–1265, Abagha 1265–1282, Arghun 1284–1291, Öljeitü 1304–1316
- Ilissus, river, [20](#)

- Illyria, [90](#), and see Dalmatia
- Imbros (Lembro), [212](#)
- Imola, [172](#)
- Imperiali, Domenico, Genoese envoy (in 1404), [392](#), [393](#)
- "Infidels," see Moslems
- Ingo de' Grimaldi, Genoese envoy (in 1408), [397](#)
- Innocent III (Lotario de' Conti of Segni), cardinal 1190–1198, pope 1198–1216: [1](#), [4–15](#), [16n](#), [20](#), [23](#), [24](#), [26](#), [30n](#), [37–42](#), [46n](#), [47](#), [59](#), [65](#), [66](#), [108](#), [112](#), [134n](#), [406–414](#), [422n](#), [462–464](#), [466](#)
- Innocent IV (Sinibaldo Fieschi), cardinal 1227–1243, pope 1243–1254: [64–67](#), [70](#), [71](#), [77](#), [96](#), [117n](#), [463n](#)
- Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise), cardinal 1273–1276, pope in 1276: [110n](#), [113](#), [116](#), [117n](#), [118](#), [121n](#), [122n](#), [123–126](#)
- Innocent VI (Étienne Aubert), cardinal 1342–1352, pope 1352–1362: [160](#), [173](#), [187](#), [211](#), [220](#), [224–240](#), [244](#), [247](#), [263](#), [265n](#), [456](#), [457](#), [463](#), [465](#)
- Innsbruck, [366](#)
- Ioannitsa (Kaloyan), Asenid tsar of Bulgaria 1197–1204, king 1204–1207: [16](#), [20](#), [21n](#), [27](#), [53](#), [59](#)
- Ionian Sea, [31](#), [45](#), [86](#), [148n](#), [382](#), [384](#), [391](#); islands of, [3](#), [18](#), and see Cephalonia, Leukas, Zante
- Ireland, Hospitaller prior of, see P. Holt
- Irene, daughter of Theodore II Lascaris and Helena; wife of Constantine Tich (from 1257, d. by 1273), [73](#), [76](#), [92](#)
- Irene, daughter of Theodore Ducas; wife of John Asen II 1237–1241 (d. after 1246), [60](#), [63](#)
- Irene, daughter of Isaac II Angelus and Margaret; wife of Philip of Swabia 1195–1208: [4](#)
- Iron Gate, [348](#)
- Isa, son of Bayazid I; contender for sultanate (in 1402), [376](#), [380](#)
- Isa, son of Umur; emir of Ephesus (in 1365), [265](#), [288](#), [344n](#)
- Isaac II Angelus, Byzantine emperor 1185–1195, co-emperor 1203–1204: [4](#), [6–8](#), [10–12](#), [17n](#), [24](#), [29](#); wife of, see Margaret (of Hungary)
- Isabella (Yolanda), daughter of John of Brienne; wife of Frederick II (Hohenstaufen) 1225–1228, princess of Jerusalem 1212–1225, queen 1225–1228: [55](#)
- Isabella, wife of Ravano dalle Carceri (*fl.* 1212), [411](#)
- Isabelle de Brienne, daughter of Gautier I (V); wife of Gautier d'Enghien (from 1320), [459](#)
- Isabelle de la Roche, daughter of Guy I; wife of Geoffrey of Briel (to 1275), wife of Hugh de Brienne 1277–1279: [80](#), [148n](#), [422](#), [432](#), [441](#)
- Isabelle de Ray, daughter of Guy; wife of Othon de la Roche (from 1207), [412](#), [417](#), [418](#)
- Isabelle de Sabran, daughter of (Isnard and) Marguerite of Villehardouin; wife of Ferdinand of Majorca 1314–1315: [153](#)
- Isabelle of Lorraine, countess of Soissons, wife of Enguerand VII de Coucy 1381–1397 (d. *ca.* 1410), [359](#)
- Isabelle of Valois, daughter of John II of France; wife of Gian Galeazzo Visconti 1360–1372: [291](#)
- Isabelle of Villehardouin, daughter of William and Anna; wife of Philip of Anjou 1271–1277, wife of Florent of Hainaut 1289–1297, wife of Philip of Savoy 1301–1311, princess of Achaia 1289–1306 (d. 1311), [104](#), [127](#), [143](#), [148](#), [149n](#), [150–153](#), [156n](#), [157](#), [433–438](#)
- Ischia, bishop of, see J. Campanus d'Itri
- Isère, river, [293](#)
- Isidore (of Kiev), cardinal 1439–1463, titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1452) 1459–1463: [36n](#)
- Islam (Arabic, *dār al-Islām*), community of Moslems, [1](#), [2](#), [97n](#), [103](#), [114](#), [133](#), [330](#), and see Moslems
- Isnard de Albarno, Hospitaller prior of Capua (in 1346), [205n](#), [208–210](#)
- Isnardo de Gaico, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#), [304](#)
- Isola di Gorgona, [334](#)
- Istanbul, see Constantinople
- Istria, [258](#), [297](#), [307](#), [323](#)
- Iusticier, Paolo, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Iviza (Ibiza), [392](#), [393](#)
- Ivrea, [308n](#); bishop of, [286n](#) (Pietro de Camera 1361–1373)
- Jacobites (Monophysites), patriarch of, see Bar Hebraeus 1252–1286
- Jacopo d'Appiano, captain of Pisa (from 1392), [340n](#)
- Jacopo da Carrara, lord of Padua 1345–1350: [210n](#)
- Jacopo da S. Vittoria, archbishop of Genoa 1342–1349: [190](#), [197](#)
- Jacopo de Nernia, bishop of Cefalù 1304–d. before 1324: [165](#)
- Jacquerie (1358), [173](#)
- Jacques d'Avesnes, lord of Euboea in 1205: [16](#), [25](#), [35](#), [405](#)
- Jacques II de Bourbon, count of La Marche 1393–1435 (d. 1438), [345](#), [354](#), [355](#), [363](#), [365](#), [366](#)
- Jacques de Cicon, Frankish baron (*fl.* 1220), [418](#); wife of, see Sibylle de la Roche
- Jacques de Helly, French crusader (in 1396), [359](#), [360](#)
- Jacques de la Roche, son of William; lord of Veligosti 1264–1302: [427](#)
- Jacques de Molay, grand master of the Templars 1298–1307 (d. 1314), [169](#)
- Jacques des Baux, grandson of Philip I of Taranto; titular Latin emperor of Constantinople and claimant to Achaia 1373–1383: [161](#), [162](#)
- Jaffa (Joppa, Yāfā), [109](#)
- James, see also Giacomo, Jacopo, Jacques
- James I ("the Conqueror"), king of Aragon-Catalonia 1213–1276: [113](#)
- James II, son of Pedro III (Peter I of Sicily); king (I) of Sicily 1285–1296, of Aragon-Catalonia 1291–1327: [163](#), [167n](#), [175](#), [446](#), [448](#), [465](#)
- James II, son of Ferdinand and Isabelle; king of Majorca 1324–1334, claimant to Achaia (in 1338, d. 1349), [153](#), [160](#), [188](#)
- James, Latin archbishop of Corinth 1307–d. by 1312: [447](#)
- James, Latin archbishop of Corinth *ca.* 1340–1349: [186](#)
- James (Petri), Latin bishop of Argos 1367–after 1384: [464n](#)
- James of Lucerne, governor of Gallipoli 1366–1367: [299](#)
- James I of Lusignan, son of Hugh IV; king of Cyprus (1382) 1383–1398: [362](#), [364](#), [382](#), [383](#), [386](#)
- James of Strassburg, blinded crusader (in 1366), [299n](#)
- Jamurlu, battle of (1413), [376](#)
- Janghara, Mamluk emir (in 1365), [268](#), [269](#)
- Janus of Lusignan, son of James I; king of Cyprus 1398–1432: [272](#), [378](#), [382–387](#), [388n](#)
- Jean II, count of Armagnac 1373–1384: [329](#)
- Jean d'Ony, French squire (*fl.* 1403), [387](#)
- Jean de Bertrand, archbishop of Tarentaise 1342–1365: [286n](#)
- Jean de Châteaumorand, French crusader (d. 1429), [334](#), [336](#), [337](#), [341](#), [360](#), [362](#), [363](#), [370](#), [376](#), [384–386](#), [390](#), [391](#)
- Jean de Chissey, bishop of Grenoble 1337–1350: [204](#)
- Jean de Gex, knight (*fl.* 1347), [208](#)
- Jean de Grailly, captal of Buech (*fl.* 1371), [327](#)
- Jean de Grolée of Virieu, Savoyard crusader (in 1366), [293](#), [302](#), [305](#)
- Jean de Hangest, lord of Heugeville (*fl.* 1395), [345](#), [366n](#)
- Jean de Lusignan, nephew of James I; titular lord of Beirut (in 1397), [362](#), [364](#)
- Jean de Marigny, bishop of Beauvais 1313–1347: [208](#)

- Jean de Monstry, Cypriote admiral (in 1366), [276](#)
- Jean de Montfaucon, French crusader (in 1366), [292](#)
- Jean de Noyer de Maisy, co-triarch of Euboea (d. 1326), [450](#); wife of, *see* Beatrice (da Verona)
- Jean de Reims, French crusader (in 1365), [265](#)
- Jean de S. Amour, Savoyard crusader (d. 1366), [293](#), [294n](#)
- Jean de Verceil, Dominican general (in 1276), [126](#)
- Jean de Vergy, governor of Franche-Comté (in 1397), [360](#), [362](#), [363](#)
- Jean de Vienne, French admiral (d. 1396), [293](#), [303](#), [345](#), [353–355](#), [362](#)
- Jeanne, daughter of Baldwin IX (I of Constantinople); countess of Flanders 1206–1244: [20](#)
- Jeanne, daughter of John III; duchess of Brabant 1355–1403: [368](#)
- Jeanne de Châtillon, daughter of Gaucher; wife of Gautier I (V) de Brienne 1306–1311, dowager duchess of Athens 1311–1355: [448](#), [450](#), [452](#)
- Jerba (Jarbah), [330](#), [331](#), [339](#), [340](#)
- Jerome (Masci) of Ascoli, *see* Nicholas IV
- Jerusalem, [1](#), [8](#), [23](#), [108n](#), [115](#), [269](#), [274](#); efforts to recover, [4](#), [6](#), [10](#), [44](#), [55](#), [98](#), [122n](#), [166](#), [242](#), [266](#), [271](#), [273](#), [337](#), [345](#), [348n](#); Latin patriarchs of, [96n](#), *and see* T. Agni 1272–1277; Melkite patriarch of, *see* Lazarus; pilgrimage to, [167n](#), [210](#), [224](#), [259](#), [329](#)
- Jerusalem, kingdom of, [32n](#), [53](#), [55](#), [98](#), [115](#), [160](#), [161](#), [163](#), [237](#), [238](#), [242](#), [266](#), [278n](#), [416n](#); kings of, *see* Conrad of Montferrat 1190–1192, John of Brienne 1210–1212 (1225), Frederick (II Hohenstaufen) 1225–1228, Conradin 1254–1268, Hugh (III) of Lusignan 1269–1284; titular after 1291, *see* Cyprus, kings of; queen of, *see* Isabella (1212) 1225–1228
- Jews, [19n](#), [267](#), [272](#), [304](#)
- Joan of Burgundy, daughter of Robert II; wife of Philip VI of France 1313–1348: [191](#)
- Joanna, daughter of Charles of Durazzo and Maria; Angevin duchess of Durazzo 1348–1368 (d. 1393), [294](#)
- Joanna I, granddaughter of Robert the Wise; Angevin queen of Naples 1343–1381, wife of Andrew of Hungary 1333–1345, wife of Louis of Taranto 1347–1362, princess of Achaia 1373–1381 (d. 1382), [161](#), [162n](#), [184](#), [188](#), [199](#), [201](#), [232](#), [241](#), [250](#), [255](#), [279](#), [292](#), [294](#), [312](#), [315](#), [458n](#), [460](#)
- Job the Iasite, Orthodox monk (*fl.* 1272), [110n](#), [111n](#)
- Johannes de Tullo, Angevin engineer (*fl.* 1279), [136](#)
- John, *see also* Giovanni, Jean
- John, archbishop of Otranto 1330–1345: [452](#)
- John, bishop of Cotrone (in 1217), [41n](#)
- John III, burgrave of Nuremberg (d. 1420), [356](#)
- John II (“the Good”), Capetian king of France 1350–1364: [191](#), [195](#), [211](#), [224n](#), [231](#), [232n](#), [238](#), [244–249](#), [260](#), [285](#), [286](#), [337](#), [458](#)
- John, son of Louis II of Bourbon; count of Clermont (to 1410), [375](#); wife of, *see* Marie
- John, son of John II of France; duke of Berry (d. 1417), [332](#), [340](#), [344](#), [375](#), [392](#), [393](#)
- John III, duke of Brabant 1312–1355: [368n](#)
- John I, son of Pedro IV; king of Aragon-Catalonia 1387–1395, duke (III) of Athens 1387–1388: [333](#), [464n](#), [467](#); wife of, *see* Yolande of Bar
- John, Latin archbishop of Athens 1351–1357: [461n](#), [463](#)
- John, Latin archbishop of Athens (*ca.* 1369), [463](#)
- John, Latin archbishop of Patras 1295–d. by 1306: [149](#), [151](#)
- John, Latin bishop of Andros (in 1233), [428](#), [429](#)
- John, Orthodox bishop of Rhaedestus (in 1212), [410n](#)
- John (“Lackland”), brother of Richard I; Plantagenet king of England 1199–1216: [414](#)
- John XXI (Pietro di Giuliano, or “Petrus Hispanus” of Lisbon), cardinal 1273–1276, pope 1276–1277: [113](#), [118n](#), [125](#), [126](#), [128](#), [129](#), [132](#), [425](#)
- John XXII (Jacques Duèse), cardinal 1312–1316, pope 1316–1334: [158](#), [159](#), [168n](#), [169](#), [171](#), [172](#), [174](#), [175](#), [176n](#), [180–184](#), [186](#), [187](#), [230](#), [448](#), [450](#), [452](#), [453](#), [465](#)
- John Asen II, nephew of Ioannitsa; Asenid tsar of Bulgaria 1218–1241: [53](#), [55–60](#), [68n](#), [72](#), [92](#); wife of, *see* Irene (Ducaena)
- John XI Beccus, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1275–1279, 1279–1282 (d. 1296), [107n](#), [120](#), [121](#), [124](#), [126](#), [128](#), [129](#), [131](#), [132](#), [143](#), [424](#), [425](#)
- John X Camaterus, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1198–1204, at Nicaea 1204–1206: [4n](#)
- John VI Cantacuzenus, son-in-law of Andronicus Palaeologus Asen; Byzantine co-emperor 1346–1347, emperor 1347–1354 (d. 1383), [127](#), [160](#), [182](#), [183](#), [189–192](#), [193n](#), [205](#), [212–215](#), [225](#), [229](#), [301](#), [307](#), [310n](#), [311n](#), [318](#), [459n](#)
- John d’Enghien, son of Gautier and Isabelle; count of Lecce 1356–1373: [459](#)
- John de’ Bonacolsi, captain of Livadia (in 1366), [444](#)
- John de’ Conti of Segni, cardinal 1200–1213: [407](#)
- John de Fusolono, Italian agent (*fl.* 1292), [150](#)
- John de Kanizsa, archbishop of Gran 1387–1418: [343](#), [356–358](#), [400](#), [403](#)
- John (I) de la Roche, son of Guy I; great lord of Athens 1263–1280: [422–424](#), [426](#), [427](#), [432](#)
- John de Lluria, brother of Roger (*fl.* 1375), [458](#), [459](#)
- John de Montelupone, Franciscan (*fl.* 1394), [466n](#)
- John de Papasidero, bishop of Cassano 1348–1373: [470](#)
- John de Royis (Rius?), Augustinian; Latin archbishop of Neopatras 1382–1390: [466](#)
- John de S. Catarina, Latin bishop of Andros 1345–1349: [429n](#)
- John I Ducas, bastard son of Michael II; lord of Neopatras *ca.* 1268–1295: [59](#), [83n](#), [85](#), [87–90](#), [121](#), [129](#), [423–426](#), [433](#), [438](#); wife of, [88](#)
- John II Ducas, son of Constantine; lord of Neopatras 1302–1318: [438](#), [440–442](#)
- John Ducas, son of Theodore; despot of Thessalonica 1237–1244: [60](#), [61](#)
- John IV Lascaris, son of Theodore II; Byzantine co-emperor at Nicaea 1258–1261: [76](#), [81](#), [85n](#), [92](#)
- John of Austria, half-brother of Philip II of Spain; victor at Lepanto (in 1571, d. 1578), [316n](#)
- John of Biandrate, Hospitaller prior of Lombardy (in 1345), [193n](#), [194](#)
- John of Bohemia, brother of Charles IV (of Luxemburg); margrave of Moravia (d. 1375), [247](#)
- John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem 1210–1212, regent 1212–1225, Latin co-emperor of Constantinople 1231–1237: [54–58](#), [63](#), [64](#)
- John of Gaunt (Ghent), son of Edward III of England; duke of Lancaster 1362–1399: [343](#), [344](#), [346](#)
- John of Gravina, son of Charles II of Anjou; Angevin prince of Achaia 1322–1333, duke of Durazzo 1333–1335: [158–160](#), [170](#), [449n](#)
- John of Jandun, polemicist (*fl.* 1324), [171](#)
- John of Lusignan, son of Hugh IV; titular prince of Antioch, regent of Cyprus 1362–1365, 1369–1375: [244](#), [250](#), [251](#), [262n](#), [264](#), [265n](#), [281–283](#), [328](#)
- John of Luxemburg, son of Henry VII; king of Bohemia 1310–1346: [172](#)
- John (“the Fearless”) of Nevers, son of Philip II; crusader (in 1396), duke of Burgundy 1404–1419: [345–349](#), [353n](#), [354](#), [355](#), [359–369](#), [399–403](#)

- John of Parma, Franciscan minister-general (in 1249), [70](#)
 John V Palaeologus, son of Andronicus III and Anna; Byzantine emperor 1341–1347, 1354–1391: [177](#), [189](#), [213](#), [215](#), [225–228](#), 229n, 231n, [233](#), [234](#), [236](#), 239n, 246n, [250](#), [255](#), [259](#), [275](#), 280n, [287](#), [288](#), [290–292](#), [294](#), [298–323](#), [325](#), [328](#), [329](#), [341](#), [361](#), 460n, 464n; wife of, *see* Helena (Cantacuzena)
 John VII Palaeologus, son of Andronicus IV; Byzantine emperor in 1390 (d. after 1408), [321](#), [322](#), [363](#), [364](#), [371–373](#), 374n, [377](#), [380](#), [384](#); wife of, *see* Eugenia Gattilusio
 John VIII Palaeologus, son of Manuel II and Helena; Byzantine co-emperor 1421–1425, emperor 1425–1448: [132](#), [371](#), [375](#)
 John III (Ducas) Vatatzes, son-in-law of Theodore I Lascaris; Byzantine emperor at Nicaea 1222–1254: [51–53](#), [57](#), [58](#), [60–64](#), [67](#), 68n, [69–72](#), [76](#), [77](#), [92](#), [97](#), 117n, [416](#); wife of, *see* Constance (Hohenstaufen)
 Joseph I, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1267–1275, 1282–1283: 110n, [111n](#), [120](#)
 Joseph II, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1416–1439: 36n
 Juvénal des Ursins, Jean, archbishop of Rheims 1449–1473: [333](#), 335n, 347n, [350](#), 351n, 376n
- Kaffa, *see* Caffa
 Kai-Ka'us II, son of Kai-Khusrau II; Seljuk sultan at Iconium 1245–1261 (d. ca. 1279), [74](#), [75](#)
 Kai-Khusrau II, Seljuk sultan at Iconium 1237–1245: [61](#), [62](#)
 Kalamata, [25](#), [31](#), [50](#), [68](#), 159n
 Kalambaka (Stargus), [439](#)
 Kalavryta, [31](#), [127](#)
 Kalavun, Bahri Mamluk soldan of Egypt and Syria 1279–1290: 120n, 121n
 Kaliakra, Cape, [304](#)
 Kalocsa, archbishop of, *see* Thomas de Kapolya
 Kaloyan, *see* Ioannitsa
 al-Kāmil Muḥammad, nephew of Saladin; Aiyūbid soldan of Egypt and Syria 1218–1238: [55](#)
 Kanizsa (now Nagykanizsa), *see* Nicholas and Stephen de Kanizsa
 Karakorum, [61](#)
 Karaman, [376](#)
 Karasi, emir of, *see* Yakhshi
 Karditza, [438](#)
 Karlstadt (Karlovac), [347](#)
 Karydi, Mount, battle of (1258), [80](#), [420](#), [433](#)
 Karytaina, [31](#), [148](#), [154](#), [432](#), [437](#); lord of, *see* Geoffrey of Briel
 Katakolo, [25](#)
 Katakolon, John, Byzantine author (fl. 1366), 246n
 Katakolou, [87](#)
 Katzenellenbogen, count of, *see* Berthold I
 Kelefa, 26n
 Kelidonya (Gelidonya), Cape, [266](#)
 Khidr (Beg), brother of Umur; emir of Ephesus (to 1348), of Aydin (from 1348), [214](#), [216–222](#), [237](#)
 Kičevo, [74](#)
 Kiev, *see* Isidore of Kiev
 Kinsterna, 99n
 Kipchaks, khanate of, *see* Golden Horde
 Kipsali, [19](#)
 Kitros, Orthodox bishop of (in 1213), [30](#)
 Klokotnitza, battle of (1230), [55](#), [56](#), [58](#), [59](#), [76](#)
 Koloman I, son of John Asen II; Asenid tsar of Bulgaria 1241–1246: 60n, [62](#), [64](#), 69n
 Koloman II, nephew of John Asen II; Asenid tsar of Bulgaria in 1257: [73](#)
 Konya (Iconium), [240](#); sultans at, *see* Seljuks
 Kossovo (Kosovo), battle of (1389), [329](#), 330n, [340](#), [350](#)
 Koundoura, [25](#), 26n
 Kubilai (Khan), brother of Möngke; great khan of the Mongols 1260–1294: [133](#)
 Kumans, *see* Cumans
 Kunigunde, daughter of Rostislav Mikhailovich; wife of Ottokar II Přemysl 1261–1278 (d. 1285), 73n
 Kutuz, Bahri Mamluk soldan of Egypt and Syria 1259–1260: [97](#)
 Kyparissia, *see* Arcadia
 Kyrenia (Cerines), [237](#), [240](#), [281](#), [382](#), [383](#)
- L'Aquila, [202](#), [435](#)
 L'Ermite de la Faye, French envoy of Genoa (in 1403), [383–386](#)
 L'Orfenal (Rumelifeneri), [301](#), [306](#)
 La Clisura, [426](#), [427](#)
 La Crémonie, *see* Lacedaemonia
 La Cuppa, [426](#), [427](#)
 La Mandria, [159](#)
 La Marche, count of, *see* Jacques II de Bourbon
 La Roche-sur-Ognon, [405](#), and *see* De la Roche family
 La Selve, Hospitaller prior of, [275](#)
 La Trémoille (Trémolay, Dramelay), *see* Guy and Guillaume de la Trémoille
 Lacedaemonia (La Crémonie), [25](#), [48](#), [50](#), [68](#); Latin bishops of (Sparta), [38](#), [96](#)
 Laconia, [31](#), [38](#); Gulf of, [31](#), [68](#)
 Ladislav of Durazzo, son of Charles III; Angevin king of Naples 1386–1414, prince of Achaia 1386–1396: [342](#), [357](#), [401](#), [403](#)
 Ladislaus, voivode of Wallachia (fl. 1365), [287](#)
 Lagopesole, [135](#)
 Lajazzo, *see* Ayas
 Lamia, *see* Zeitounion
 Lampsacus, [72](#), [90](#), [231](#), [236](#)
 Lancaster, duke of, *see* John of Gaunt; house of, [402](#)
 Lancia, Nicholas, vicar-general of Athens 1331-ca. 1335: [453](#)
 Languedoc, [398](#)
 Laodicea (ad Lycum, in Anatolia), titular Latin bishop of, *see* Simon
 Laodicea (in Syria; Lichia, Latakia, al-Lādhīqīyah), [279](#), [282](#)
 Larissa, [22](#), [45](#), [53](#), [60](#), [87](#), [329](#); Latin archbishops of, [40](#), [47](#), [412](#); lord of, *see* William
 Larmena, [426](#), [427](#), [448](#), [450](#); lord of, *see* Thomas of Verona
 Lascaris, Byzantine imperial dynasty at Nicaea (1204) 1208–1261: 13n, [73](#), [143](#), and *see* Constantine Lascaris 1204–1205, Theodore I Lascaris 1205–1222, John III (Ducas) Vatatzes 1222–1254, Theodore II “Lascaris” 1254–1258, John IV “Lascaris” 1258–1261; *see also* Eudocia, Irene, Maria, and Theodora (Lascaris)
 Lascaris, Alexius, brother of Theodore I (fl. 1222), [52](#)
 Lascaris, Isaac, brother of Theodore I (fl. 1222), [52](#)
 Lascaris, Michael, governor of Thessalonica (in 1257), [74](#), [75](#)
 Lateran Councils, Third (1179), [38](#); Fourth (1215), [46](#), [47](#), [112](#)
 Lateran palace (at Rome), 37n, 44n, [67](#), [108](#), [123](#), [133](#), 134n, [147](#), [152](#), [170](#), [176](#), [412](#), [446](#)
 Latin empire of Constantinople (“Romania”), [1–3](#), [8](#), [12–14](#), [16–21](#), [27](#), [34](#), [39](#), [40](#), [43–45](#), [49–51](#), [54–57](#), 60n, 63–[68](#), [70](#), [71](#), [77](#), [80](#), [83](#), [90](#), [92](#), [93](#), [95–97](#), [104](#), [105](#), [111](#), [135](#), [142](#), [164–168](#), [179](#), [406](#), [412](#), [414](#), [416](#), [435](#), [463](#); emperors of, [12](#), [19](#), [46](#), [431](#), and *see* Baldwin I 1204–

- 1205, Henry d' Angre (1205) 1206–1216, Peter of Courtenay in 1217, Robert of Courtenay 1221–1228, Baldwin II 1228–1261 (with John of Brienne 1231–1237); empress of, *see* Yolande 1217–1219; titular emperors and empresses of, *see* Baldwin II 1261–1273, Philip of Courtenay 1273–1283, Catherine of Courtenay 1283–1307 (with Charles of Valois 1301–1307), Catherine of Valois 1307–1346 (with Philip I of Taranto 1313–1331), Robert of Taranto 1346–1364 (with Marie of Bourbon 1347–1364), Philip II of Taranto 1364–1373, Jacques des Baux 1373–1383; *see also* Louis I and II of Anjou (claimants after 1383)
- Latini, Brunetto, Italian writer (d. ca. 1294), [9](#)
- Laurent d'Albiars, bishop of Tulle 1361–1369: [263](#)
- Lausanne, bishop of (Aimo de Cossonay 1355–1375), [286n](#)
- Lavatia (Vatika), [380](#)
- Lazar I, ruler of the Serbs 1371–1389: [350](#)
- Lazarus, Melkite (Orthodox) patriarch of Jerusalem (before 1341–d. after 1367), [310](#)
- Le Bourget, [291](#), [366](#)
- Le Puy (-en-Velay), [223](#)
- Lecce, counts of, *see* Hugh, Gautier V and VI de Brienne, John d'Enghien
- Lechaina, [159](#)
- Lemnos, [18](#), [426n](#); lord of, *see* P. Navigajoso
- Lemona, [303](#), [305](#)
- Lentiana, [69](#)
- Leo VI, Byzantine emperor 886–912: [37n](#)
- Leo, Orthodox bishop of Heraclea (in 1281), [135](#)
- Leo IX (Bruno of Egisheim), pope 1049–1054: [117n](#)
- Leon III, Hetoumid king of Cilician Armenia 1269–1289: [130](#)
- León, *see* Castile and León
- Leonard, Latin bishop of Olena (from 1300), [149n](#)
- Leonard (Faler), titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1302–?1305: [150n](#)
- Leonardo, Latin archbishop of Crete by 1263–1289: [99](#)
- Leondari, [437](#)
- Leone dalle Carceri, father of Grapella; claimant as heir of Carintana (*fl.* 1255), [78](#), [80](#)
- Leopold IV, nephew of Albert III; Hapsburg duke of Austria 1395–1404: [347](#)
- Leoterio, bishop of Veroli 1280–1314: [148n](#)
- Lepanto (Naupactus), [233](#), [258](#), [326](#), [435](#); battle of (1571), [1](#), [316n](#); Latin bishops of, [186](#) (John, d. 1345), and *see* Giovanni de Montelupone; Orthodox archbishop of, *see* J. Apocaucus; straits of, [86](#), [419](#)
- Lercari, Costantino, Genoese merchant (*fl.* 1397), [366](#)
- Lérída, [467](#)
- Les Baux, *see* Bertrand (2), Jacques, and Marie des Baux
- Les Estoires de Venise, [9](#)
- Lesbos (Mytilene), [18](#), [52](#), [104](#), [182](#), [204](#), [298](#), [359](#), [361](#), [363](#), [371](#), [394](#); lords of, *see* Gattilusio family
- Lescot, Jean, Angevin captain of Durazzo (in 1281), [137](#)
- Lesina (Alesna, Hvar), [307](#), [404](#)
- Lesparre (-Médoc), *see* Florimont de Lesparre
- Leukas (Santa Maura, Leucadia), [90](#), [113n](#), [381](#), [422](#), [452](#)
- Licario, knight from Vicenza (*fl.* 1276), [131](#), [425–428](#); wives of, [426](#), [428](#)
- Liconia, [82](#), [418](#), [451n](#)
- Lido (S. Niccolò di Lido), [5](#), [297](#), [307](#)
- Liège, [171](#), [402](#); archdeacon of, [107](#)
- Liguria, [190](#), [378](#), [398](#)
- Lille, [368](#)
- Limassol, [265n](#), [272](#); archdeacon of, *see* P. Damandi; bishops of, *see* L. Balduino, Guy d'Ibelin, Aymar de Lavont
- Limbourg brothers, painters (*fl.* 1400), [375](#)
- Limousin, [169](#), [224](#)
- Linz, [347](#)
- Lipari, bishop of, [226n](#)
- Lippomano, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Lisbon, [113](#)
- Livadia (Lebadea), [89](#), [414](#), [441](#), [443](#), [445](#), [456](#), [459](#), [467](#), [469](#), [471](#), [472](#); captains and castellans of, *see* John de' Bonacolsi, William de Almenara; lords of, *see* William de la Roche, Bertranet Mota
- Livadostro, [421](#)
- Lluria, family, [460](#), and *see* John and Roger (2) de Lluria
- Logaras, Romanus, Greek of Thessalonica (d. by 1213), [29](#), [30](#); wife of, *see* Sachlikina
- Loidoriki, [87n](#), [410n](#), [442](#), [444](#), [451](#), [454](#), [471](#)
- Loire, river, [402](#)
- Lollards, [173](#)
- Lombardy, [13](#), [37](#), [152](#), [172](#), [206](#), [246](#); crusaders from, [21](#), [193](#); Hospitaller prior of, *see* John of Biandrate; knights from, [27–30](#), [35](#), [36n](#), [43](#), [50](#), [53](#), [56](#), [416](#), [424](#), [450](#)
- London, [147n](#), [232](#), [251](#), [369](#), [373](#), [374](#)
- Longo, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Loredan, Jacopo, Venetian castellan (in 1383), [324](#)
- Loredan, Piero, Venetian commander (in 1420), [404](#)
- Lorenzo de Monacis, chancellor of Crete 1388–1429: [250n](#)
- Lorraine (Lothringen), *see* Isabelle of Lorraine; nobles of, [247](#)
- Lotario de' Conti of Segni, *see* Innocent III
- Louis I ("the Great"), great-grandson of Charles II of Anjou; Angevin king of Hungary 1342–1382, of Poland 1370–1382: [197](#), [199](#), [200](#), [210](#), [214](#), [227n](#), [228n](#), [247n](#), [248n](#), [249n](#), [250](#), [251n](#), [253n](#), [255](#), [280n](#), [286–291](#), [298](#), [300](#), [307n](#), [322](#), [328](#), [366](#), [401](#), [403](#), [460n](#)
- Louis VIII, son of Philip II; Capetian king of France 1223–1226: [51](#); wife of, *see* Blanche of Castile
- Louis IX, son of Louis VIII and Blanche; Capetian king of France 1226–1270 (canonized), [2](#), [61n](#), [65](#), [66n](#), [69](#), [95](#), [96n](#), [102](#), [103](#), [105–109](#), [128](#), [146](#), [266](#), [332](#), [421](#), [428](#)
- Louis I, count of Blois 1191–1205: [13](#), [16](#)
- Louis II, count of Flanders 1346–1384: [327](#)
- Louis I (of Clermont), duke of Bourbon 1327–1342: [179](#), [297n](#)
- Louis II (of Clermont), son of Pierre I; duke of Bourbon 1356–1410, claimant to Achaea (in [1387](#)), [332–338](#), [340](#), [375](#)
- Louis I, son of Charles V of France; duke of Touraine 1386–1391, of Orléans 1391–1407: [291n](#), [332](#), [333](#), [340](#), [343](#), [344](#), [346](#), [347n](#), [359](#), [399](#), [402](#); wife of, *see* Valentina Visconti
- Louis I ("the Pious"), son of Charlemagne; emperor of the Franks 814–840: [38](#)
- Louis d'Enghien, son of (Gautier and) Isabelle de Brienne; count of Conversano 1356–d. by 1390, titular duke of Athens 1381–d. by 1390: [459](#)
- Louis I of Anjou, son of John II of France; duke of Anjou, titular king of Naples 1382–1384, claimant to Achaea 1383–1384: [325](#)
- Louis II of Anjou, son of Louis I; claimant to Achaea (in 1384) and Naples 1384–1417: [342](#)
- Louis of Burgundy, son of Robert II; prince of Achaea and titular king of Thessalonica 1313–1316: [153](#); wife of, *see* Mahaut of Hainaut
- Louis of Chalon, brother of Hugh; French crusader (d. 1366), [292](#), [293](#), [295n](#), [299](#)
- Louis of Champlite, brother of Guillaume (d. 1208), [33](#)
- Louis of Savoy, brother of Amadeo; claimant to Achaea 1402–1418: [153](#)

- Louis of Taranto, son of Philip I and Catherine; Angevin king of Naples 1347–1362: 199n, [232](#); wife of, *see* Joanna I (of Naples)
- Louvain, *see* Henry I of Louvain
- Louvre, palace (at Paris), [373](#), [375](#)
- Low Countries, [402](#), [403](#), and *see* Brabant, Flanders, Hainaut
- Lucca, [126](#), 139n, [279](#), 308n, and *see* Ptolemy of Lucca; bankers of, 142n, [221](#), [362](#); lord of, *see* C. Castracani
- Lucchino dal Verme, Venetian condottiere (*fl.* 1364), [254](#), [255](#), 260n, [291](#), [292](#)
- Lucio, Desiderio, Venetian notary (*fl.* 1364), [252](#), [262](#)
- Ludolf of Sudheim ("Suchem"), German traveler (*fl.* 1340), 268n
- Ludwig IV, Wittelsbach duke of Bavaria, king of Germany 1314–1328, emperor 1328–1347: [171](#), [172](#), [175](#), [187](#), [194](#), 199n
- Lugo, castle, [247](#)
- Lull, Ramón, Catalan missionary (d. 1315 or 1316), [109](#), [166](#), [174](#)
- Lupelli, Pietro and Stefano, Italian canons in Greece (*fl.* 1292), [150](#)
- Lusignan, royal dynasty in Jerusalem (to 1291) and Cyprus 1192–1474: [241](#), [266](#), 278n, [329](#), [382](#), [383](#), [385](#), and *see* Henry I 1218–1253, Hugh III 1267–1284, Hugh IV 1324–1359, Peter I 1359–1369, Peter II 1369–1382, James I 1382–1398, Janus 1398–1432; *see also* Guy, Hugh, Jean, and John of Lusignan
- Luxemburg, *see* Nicholas of Luxemburg; duke of, [247](#); house of, [173](#), and *see* Henry VII, John of Luxemburg, Charles IV, Wenceslas, Sigismund, and Beatrice of Luxemburg
- Lyon, [70](#), [110–115](#), [118](#), [119](#), [121](#), [211](#), [232](#), [292](#), [344](#); archbishops of, 110n, 123n, and *see* Henri I and II de Villars, Guillaume of Thurey; First Council of (1245), [64](#), [112](#), [113](#); Second Council of (1274), [109–120](#), [124–126](#), [128](#), [133](#), [135](#), [142](#), [143](#), [424](#); Union of, *see* Union of the Churches
- Macarius, Orthodox metropolitan of Ankara (in 1403), [384n](#)
- Macarius, Orthodox metropolitan of Athens (in 1394), [471](#), [472](#)
- Macedonia, [16](#), [18](#), [21](#), [29](#), [45](#), [52](#), [55](#), [56](#), [61](#), [70](#), [72](#), [74–77](#), [81](#), [83](#), [85](#), [87](#), [90](#), 93n, 137n, 166n, [215](#), 317n, [320](#), [439](#), [441](#)
- Machaeras, Leontius (Leontios Makhairas), chronicler (*fl.* 1426), [237](#), [240](#), [264–266](#), [275](#), [278](#), [281](#), [283](#), [382](#)
- Machaut, *see* Guillaume de Machaut
- Mâcon, [232](#); bishop of (Philippe de S. Croix 1360–1380), 286n
- Macrembolites, Demetrius, friend of M. Choniates (*fl.* 1210), [418](#)
- Macri, [28](#), [40](#), [52](#)
- Madrid, MS. at, 155n
- al-Maghrib, *see* North Africa
- Magnesia, [76](#)
- Mahaut de Hainaut, daughter of Florent and Isabelle; wife of Guy II de la Roche 1305–1308, wife of Louis of Burgundy 1313–1316, wife of Hugh of Lapalisse *ca.* 1320–1322, princess of Achaea 1313–1318 (1321, d. 1331), [153](#), [437](#), [440](#)
- Mahdia (al-Mahdiyyah, "Auffrique"), [330](#), [331](#), [333–340](#)
- Mahona, of Chios, 207n, 247n, [399](#); of Cyprus, [382](#), [383](#), [386](#)
- Maina, 36n, [68](#), and *see* Grand Magne; peninsula, [25](#), 26n, [31](#), [68](#)
- Mainz, archbishops of, [173](#)
- Majorca (Mallorca), 189n, 456n, [467](#); king of, *see* James II 1324–1334; *see also* Ferdinand, Sancia
- Makronesi, [408](#)
- Malaspina, Michele, Genoese envoy (in 1364), [259](#)
- Malatesta, ruling family at Rimini 1237–1538: [172](#)
- Malea, Cape, 113n
- Malian Gulf, [87](#)
- Malta, archives of, [161](#); counts of, *see* Margaritone of Brindisi, E. Pescatore, A. Fadrique, L. Fadrique
- Mamluks, "Bahri," slave dynasty in Egypt and Syria 1250–1382, 1389–1390: [2](#), [3](#), [97](#), [98](#), [108](#), [109](#), [116](#), [120](#), [146](#), [163](#), [167](#), [174](#), 182n, 197n, [235](#), [262](#), [263](#), [265–267](#), [272](#), [275–283](#), [292](#), and *see* Kutuz 1259–1260, Baibars 1260–1277, Kalavun 1279–1290, al-Ashraf Khalil 1290–1293, an-Nâsir Muhammad 1293–1294, 1299–1309, 1310–1341, Sha'bân 1363–1376
- Mamluks, "Burji," slave dynasty in Egypt and Syria 1382–1389, 1390–1517: 339n, 384n, [385](#), [387](#), [388](#), [391](#), and *see* Barkuk 1382–1389, 1390–1399, Faraj 1399–1405, 1406–1412
- Manfred, son of Frederick II of Sicily; duke of Athens 1312–1317: [445](#)
- Manfred, bastard son of Frederick II; Hohenstaufen king of Sicily 1258–1266: 62n, [77](#), [81–84](#), [86](#), [87](#), [89](#), [90](#), [95](#), [98](#), [100](#), [102](#), [104](#), [108](#), [138](#), [141](#), [146](#), [427](#); wife of, *see* Helena (Ducaena)
- Manfred (de Cocconatu), Latin bishop of Chios 1360–1383: [247](#)
- Manfredi, ruling family at Imola and Faenza, [172](#), [231](#)
- Manfredo de Chiaramonte, Sicilian admiral, lord of Jerba (from 1389), [330](#), [338–340](#)
- Manicaïtes ("Magnicartes"), George, Byzantine chancellor (in 1366), [288](#)
- Manolada, battle of (1316), [153](#)
- Mansueti, Giovanni, Venetian artist (d. *ca.* 1527), [284](#)
- Mantua (Mantova), [172](#), 210n, [279](#), 308n; lords of, *see* P. Bonaccolsi, L. Gonzaga
- Manuel II, Orthodox patriarch at Nicaea 1244–1254: [70](#), [71](#), 117n
- Manuel I Comnenus, grandson of Alexius I; Byzantine emperor 1143–1180: [4n](#), [5](#), [17](#), 35n, 59n, 407n
- Manuel Ducas, brother of Theodore of Epirus; despot of Thessalonica 1230–1237 (d. 1241), [30](#), [51](#), [58–60](#), 69n, [419](#); wife of, *see* Maria (Asenina)
- Manuel II Palaeologus, son of John V and Helena; Byzantine co-emperor 1373–1391, emperor 1391–1425: [225](#), [228](#), [288](#), [300](#), 306n, 310n, [316](#), [317](#), [320](#), [321](#), [325](#), 329n, [341](#), [346](#), [363](#), [368–384](#), 385n, [398](#), [400](#), 472n; wife of, *see* Helena (Dragaš)
- Mar Jabalaha (Yabhalāhā) III, Nestorian patriarch (in 1288), [147](#)
- Marathon (Mareton), [408](#), [419](#)
- Marathonisi, Gulf of, [389](#)
- Marca Trivigiana, [322](#)
- Marcel, Étienne, Parisian leader (d. 1358), [232](#)
- Marchionne di Coppo Stefani, Italian chronicler (d. 1385), 279n
- Marco and Marchetto, papal couriers (in 1278), [128](#), [129](#), 130n, [425](#)
- Marco da Viterbo, cardinal 1366–1369: [282](#)
- Marco di Canava, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), 295n, [302](#), [304](#)
- Margaret ("Maria"), sister of Emeric I of Hungary; wife of Isaac II Angelus 1185–1204, wife of Boniface I of Montferrat 1204–1207, wife of Nicholas I of S. Omer (after 1207), [16](#), [21](#), [28–30](#), [50](#), 418n
- Margaret of Flanders, daughter of Louis II; wife of Philip II

- of Burgundy 1384–1404, countess of Flanders 1384–1405: [344](#), [362](#), [365](#), [366](#)
- Margaret of Soissons (“Maria”), queen of Armenia (*ca.* 1373), [328](#)
- Margaritone of Brindisi, Sicilian admiral, count of Malta (d. 1195), [3](#)
- Marghera, [243](#)
- Marguerite (de Neuilly) de Passavant, wife of Guglielmo II da Verona (to 1271), claimant to Akova (in 1276), [154n](#)
- Marguerite of Villehardouin, daughter of William and Anna; wife of Isnard de Sabran 1294–1297, wife of Riccardo Orsini 1299–1304, lady of Akova (d. 1315), [104](#), [127](#), [153](#), [435n](#)
- Maria, daughter of Frederick III; duchess of Athens 1377–1380, queen of Sicily 1377–1402, wife of Martin I 1391–1402: [330](#), [466](#), [467](#)
- Maria, queen of Armenia, *see* Margaret of Soissons
- Maria, daughter of Michael VIII Palaeologus; wife of Abagha 1265–1282 (d. 1308), [106](#), [120](#)
- Maria (Kyratsa), daughter of (John) Alexander of Bulgaria; wife of Andronicus IV 1356–1379 (d. 1390), [300n](#)
- Maria (Marie), daughter of John of Brienne; wife of Baldwin II 1231–1273 (d. *ca.* 1275), [54](#)
- Maria, daughter of Andronicus III Palaeologus; wife of Francesco I Gattilusio 1354–1384: [225](#), [360n](#), [361](#)
- Maria, niece of D. Strez; wife of Henry d’Angre 1211–1216: [43](#)
- Maria (Beloslava), bastard daughter of John Asen II; wife of Manuel Ducas 1225–1237: [58](#)
- Maria, daughter of Manuel I Comnenus; wife of Nerio of Montferrat 1179–1183: [17](#)
- Maria, daughter of Theodore II Lascaris; wife of Nicephorus I 1256–1258: [60](#), [73](#), [76](#)
- Maria of Anjou, sister of Joanna I of Naples; wife of Charles of Durazzo 1343–1348, wife of Philip II of Taranto 1355–1366: [199n](#)
- Maria Petraliphas (Petraliphina), sister of Theodora; wife of Philippe Chinard (*fl.* 1257), [59n](#), [74](#)
- Marie, wife of Philippe d’Artois (to 1397), wife of John, count of Clermont (from 1400), [375](#)
- Marie des Baux, daughter of Bertrand (of Montescaglioso); wife of Humbert II of Viennois 1332–1347: [194n](#), [196](#), [197](#), [200](#), [206](#), [209–211](#)
- Marie of Bourbon, daughter of Louis I; wife of Guy of Lusignan 1328–1346, wife of Robert of Taranto 1347–1364, titular Latin empress of Constantinople 1347–1379 (d. 1387), [161](#), [237](#), [238n](#), [244](#), [297](#), [308](#)
- Marini, Niccolò, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), [294n](#), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Marinids, Berber dynasty in Morocco 1196–1465: [330](#), *and see* Ahmad 1373–1384, 1387–1393
- Marino II dalle Carceri, son of Narzotto and Felisa; triarch of Euboea (*fl.* 1289), [433](#)
- Marino di Simone Resti, rector of Ragusa (in 1396), [357](#)
- Maritsa (Hebrus), river, [16](#), [17n](#), [18](#), [19](#), [55](#), [57](#), [62](#), [72](#), [73](#), [246n](#), [317n](#), [320](#), [327](#), [328](#), [350](#), [361](#)
- Marittima, [169](#), [231](#)
- Marmara, Sea of, [12n](#), [18](#), [52](#), [92](#), [164n](#), [239n](#), [307](#), [311](#), [321](#), [371](#), [410n](#)
- “Marmousets,” [332](#)
- Marquardt (Marchardus) de Randeck, bishop of Augsburg 1348–1365, patriarch of Aquileia 1365–1381: [229n](#), [323](#)
- Marquesan, Raymond, Niçois captain (*fl.* 1346), [202](#), [203](#), [208](#)
- Marrakesh (Marrākush), [330](#)
- Marseille, [196](#), [197](#), [206](#), [232](#), [243](#), [275](#), [330](#), [333](#); merchants of, [270](#); ships from, [295](#), [297](#), [302–304](#), [305n](#)
- Marsiglio of Padua, polemicist (*fl.* 1324), [171](#)
- Martin I (“the Elder”), son of Pedro IV; king of Aragon-Catalonia 1395–1410, king (II) of Sicily 1409–1410: [370n](#), [372–374](#), [464n](#)
- Martin I (“the Younger”), son of Martin I “the Elder”; king of Sicily 1391–1409, titular duke of Athens, [330n](#), [340](#), [467](#); wife of, *see* Maria
- Martin IV (Simon de Brion), cardinal 1261–1281, pope 1281–1285: [105](#), [123](#), [134](#), [135](#), [138–144](#), [146](#), [165](#)
- Martin de Alpartil, Spanish cleric (*fl.* 1399), [370n](#)
- Martin of Troppau, Bohemian chronicler (d. 1278), [113](#)
- Martinez de Luna, Pedro, *see* Benedict XIII
- Martino da Canale, Italian chronicler (d. *ca.* 1275), [9](#), [10](#)
- Martino di Campofregoso, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [301n](#), [304](#)
- Marulla (Maria), daughter of Boniface of Verona; lady of Carystus and Aegina, wife of Alfonso Fadrique 1317–1326: [448](#), [450](#), [451](#), [454](#)
- Mascó, James, Latin archbishop of Neopatras 1344–1361: [465](#)
- Massa Trabaria, [231](#)
- Mastino II della Scala, co-lord of Verona (d. 1351), [204](#), [210n](#)
- Matagrifon, *see* Akova
- Matapan, Cape, [53](#), [68](#), [297](#), [320](#), [360n](#), [384](#), [389](#)
- Matharas, Nicholas, merchant at Pera (*fl.* 1397), [362](#), [364](#)
- Matteo de Moncada, vicar-general of Athens 1359–1361, 1363–1366: [458](#)
- Matthew, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Neopatras 1376–d. by 1382: [465](#), [466](#)
- Matthew Paris, English chronicler (d. 1259), [97](#)
- Maupertuis, [231](#)
- Mazzara, [465](#); bishop of, *see* Ferrer d’Abella
- Mecca (Makkah), pilgrimage to, [267](#)
- Mediterranean Sea, [177](#), [264n](#); basin of, [146](#), [241](#), [260](#), [446](#); central, [451](#); coast of, [116](#), [232](#), [330](#); eastern, [100n](#), [163](#), [178](#), [182](#), [183](#), [239](#), [277](#), [387](#), [455](#); western, [330](#), [331](#)
- Megara, [19](#), [28n](#), [80](#), [408](#), [409](#), [415n](#), [459](#), [461](#), [462](#), [467](#), [468](#); titular Latin bishop of, *see* J. Boyl
- Megarid, [83](#), [420](#)
- Mehmed, emir of Aydin (d. 1334), [181](#)
- Mehmed I (“the Gentleman”), son of Bayazid I; contender for the sultanate 1402–1413, Ottoman sultan 1413–1421: [306n](#), [376](#)
- Mehmed II (Fatih, “the Conqueror”), son of Murad II; Ottoman sultan 1451–1481: [162](#)
- Melfi, [434](#); bishop of, *see* Antonio
- Melings, [25](#), [26n](#), [68](#)
- “Melissenus” (Melissurgus), Macarius, Greek compiler (d. 1585), [316n](#)
- Meliteniotes, Constantine, Orthodox archdeacon (*fl.* 1270), [107n](#), [120](#)
- Melnik, [62](#), [69](#)
- Melos (Milo), [19n](#)
- Memo, Giovanni, captain of Tenedos (in 1383), [324](#)
- Mende, bishop of (Pierre Gérard de Roure 1362–1366), [245](#), *and see* G. Durand
- Menisi, [408](#)
- Menteshe, [341](#), [376](#)
- Mercedarians, order, *see* A. Blasi (Dexart?)
- Mesarites, John, brother of Nicholas (d. 1207), [12n](#)
- Mesarites, Nicholas, Orthodox metropolitan of Ephesus (from *ca.* 1213), [9](#), [12n](#)
- Mesembria (Nesebar), [302–306](#), [308](#), [309](#)
- Mesopotamites, Constantine, Orthodox metropolitan of Thessalonica (in 1225), [51](#)

- Messenia, [24](#), [25](#), [34](#), [127](#), [155](#), [433](#); Gulf of, [31](#), [68](#)
 Messina, [131](#), [140](#), [227](#), [258](#), [338](#), [459](#), [466](#)
 Mestre, [243](#), [260](#)
 Meteorium, [94](#)
 Metochites, George, Orthodox archdeacon (in 1275), [120–126](#)
 Metochites, Theodore, son of George; Byzantine official (*fl.* 1305), [121n](#)
 Mézières, *see* Philippe de Mézières
 Michael Asen, son of John Asen II and Irene; Asenid tsar of Bulgaria 1246–1257: [72](#), [73](#)
 Michael I Ducas, great-grandson of Alexius I Comnenus; ruler of Epirus [1204–1215](#): [25](#), [29](#), [35](#), [36](#), [42](#), [43](#), [58](#), [406](#)
 Michael II Ducas, son of Michael I; despot of Epirus 1231–*ca.* 1267: [58–60](#), [69](#), [70](#), [73–77](#), [81–90](#), [93n](#), [104](#), [129n](#), [422](#), [423n](#); wife of, *see* Theodora Petraliphas
 Michael (Fuschi) of Cesena, Franciscan polemicist (d. 1342), [172](#)
 Michael VIII Palaeologus, son of Andronicus; Byzantine co-emperor at Nicaea 1259–1261, emperor in Constantinople 1261–1282: [4](#), [36](#), [62n](#), [69](#), [73–77](#), [81](#), [83–85](#), [88–92](#), [94–96](#), [98–107](#), [109–114](#), [116](#), [117](#), [119–126](#), [128–139](#), [140n](#), [143](#), [144](#), [165](#), [228](#), [422–428](#), [432](#), [433](#), [438](#)
 Michael IX Palaeologus, son of Andronicus II; Byzantine co-emperor 1294–1320: [164n](#), [435n](#), [441](#)
 Michael (Mikhail) Vsevolodovich, prince of Chernigov (d. 1246, canonized), [73n](#)
 Michel ("Michally"), Aimon, crusader (in 1366), [299](#)
 Michiel, Angelo, Venetian agent (in 1364), [252](#)
 Michiel, Domenico, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1364–1366: [254](#), [255](#), [276](#), [459](#)
 Michiel, Francesco, archbishop of Crete 1342–1349: [186](#), [194](#), [197](#), [203n](#), [206](#), [208–210](#), [212](#), [214](#), [216](#), [217](#)
 Midi, [169](#), [174](#), [176](#), [248](#)
 Mihalić (Karacabey), [359–363](#), [375](#)
 Milan (Milano), [172](#), [188](#), [190](#), [197](#), [204](#), [210n](#), [213](#), [231](#), [233](#), [243](#), [253](#), [254](#), [259](#), [260](#), [279n](#), [291](#), [347](#), [360n](#), [398](#), and *see* Aroldo da Milano; archbishop of, *see* G. Visconti; duchy of, [291n](#); dukes of, *see* G. G. Visconti 1395–1402, G. Visconti 1402–1412, F. M. Visconti 1412–1447; tyrants of, *see* L. Visconti 1339–1349, Giovanni Visconti 1349–1354, B. Visconti 1354–1385, G. G. Visconti 1385–1395
 Miletus (Palatia), [290](#); emir of, *see* Muḥammad
 Minorites, *see* Franciscans
 Minotto, Marco, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1325–1327: [451n](#)
 Mircea ("the Elder"), voivode of Wallachia (*fl.* 1395), [341](#), [353n](#), [354](#)
 Mistra, [31](#), [68](#), [82](#), [98](#), [99n](#), [126](#), [127](#), [154](#), [158](#), [159](#), [322](#), [379](#), [381](#), [427](#), [437](#); Byzantine governors at, [149](#), and *see* Cantacuzenus, Andronicus Palaeologus Asen; "despotate" of, [127](#), [319n](#), [372](#), [379–381](#); despots at, *see* Manuel Cantacuzenus 1349–1380, Palaeologi 1382–1460
 Mocenigo, Leonardo, Venetian commander (in 1403), [380](#), [381](#), [383](#), [389](#), [390](#)
 Mocenigo, Tommaso, Venetian commander (in 1396), doge of Venice 1414–1423: [356–358](#), [367](#), [396](#)
 Modena, [279](#)
 Modon, [13](#), [19](#), [20n](#), [24](#), [25](#), [28n](#), [34](#), [48](#), [144](#), [155](#), [178](#), [180n](#), [207](#), [239](#), [297](#), [300](#), [307](#), [326](#), [356n](#), [364](#), [371](#), [379–384](#), [389–395](#), [402n](#), [405](#); castellans of, [250n](#), [380n](#), [390](#), [392](#), [472n](#); Latin bishops of, [38](#)
 Moldavia, [61](#)
 Molyscus, [86](#), [88](#)
 Monaco, [206](#)
 Monastir (in Serbia), [88](#); plains of, [43](#), [62](#), [74](#)
 Monastir (in Tunisia), [334](#)
 Monemvasia (Malvasia), [26](#), [36–38](#), [54n](#), [63](#), [68](#), [69](#), [86](#), [98](#), [99n](#), [126](#), [207](#), [380](#), [382](#), [406](#), [427](#); Orthodox archbishops of, [316n](#), [406n](#), and *see* Dorotheus
 Möngke, nephew of Ögödei; great khan of the Mongols 1251–1259: [97](#)
 Mongols, or Tatars, [60–62](#), [73n](#), [74](#), [75](#), [96n](#), [97](#), [98n](#), [106](#), [108n](#), [166n](#), [185n](#), [202](#), [206](#), [376n](#); great khans of, *see* Ögödei 1227–1242, Güyük 1246–1248, Möngke 1251–1259, Kubilai 1260–1294; *see also* Golden Horde, Il-khans, Kipchaks
 Monophysites, *see* Jacobites
 Monovgat, emir of, [240](#), [241](#)
 Monreale, [258](#)
 Mont Cenis, pass, [291](#), [308n](#)
 Mont Genève, pass, [233](#)
 Mont S. Michel, abbot of, *see* Robert of Torigny
 Montbéliard, [346](#), [347](#)
 Monte Cassino, abbot of, *see* Bernard Ayglier; bishop of (Guillaume de Rosières 1346–1353), [208](#)
 Montefeltri, ruling family at Urbino (to 1508), [172](#)
 Montefiascone, [177](#), [282](#), [308n](#)
 Montereau, [402](#)
 Montescaglioso, count of, *see* Bertrand des Baux
 Montferrat, house of, [53](#), and *see* Agnes, Demetrius, Nerio; marquis (margraves) of, *see* Guglielmo III 1135–1188, Conrad 1188–1192, Boniface I 1192–1207, Guglielmo IV 1207–1225, Boniface II 1225–1253, Giovanni II 1330–1372, Theodore II Palaeologus 1381–1418; marquise of, [152](#)
 Montpellier, [230](#), [245n](#), [362](#), [392](#), [393](#)
 Moors, *see* Moslems
 Morocco, [268](#); "king" of, *see* Aḥmad; rulers of, *see* Muwāḥhids 1130–1269, Marinids 1196–1465; ships of, [280](#), [282](#)
 Morosini, Antonio, Venetian chronicler (d. 1434), [356n](#), [383](#), [386n](#), [387n](#), [390](#), [391](#), [394](#)
 Morosini, Bernardo, Venetian official in Cyprus (in 1403), [387n](#), [388](#), [389](#)
 Morosini, Francesco, Venetian official (in 1669), doge 1688–1694: [178n](#)
 Morosini, Michele, doge of Venice in 1382: [323](#), [324n](#)
 Morosini, Niccolò, bishop of Castello (Venice) 1336–1367: [233](#), [263](#), [276](#)
 Morosini, Tommaso, Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1205–1211: [14](#), [15n](#), [26](#), [29n](#), [39](#), [40](#), [46n](#), [406](#), [410](#), [412](#)
 Mortaigne, [20](#)
 Moscho, Peter, Greek moneylender (*fl.* 1380), [466](#)
 Moslems (al-Muslimūn, Saracens, Moors), [1](#), [9](#), [60](#), [74](#), [96n](#), [97](#), [103](#), [109](#), [110](#), [113–115](#), [123](#), [136](#), [140n](#), [142n](#), [146](#), [149](#), [164–167](#), [168n](#), [170](#), [174](#), [178](#), [179n](#), [182](#), [183](#), [192](#), [202](#), [210](#), [213](#), [218](#), [222](#), [227](#), [229](#), [234](#), [239](#), [241](#), [242](#), [244n](#), [247](#), [248](#), [250](#), [251](#), [253](#), [259](#), [262](#), [263](#), [267–283](#), [285–287](#), [330–332](#), [334–340](#), [344](#), [345](#), [350](#), [352](#), [367](#), [373](#), [374n](#), [384–388](#), [391](#), [394](#), [446](#), [454](#), [455](#), [458n](#)
 Mosynopolis, [16](#), [27](#), [52](#); bishop of, [429](#)
 Mudazzo (Muazzo), Zanachi, Venetian bailie of Tenedos (in 1381), [323–326](#)
 Muḥammad, emir of Miletus (Palatia) in 1365: [265](#), [288](#), [344n](#)
 Muḥammad I, Hafsid ruler of Tunisia 1249–1277 (caliph 1253), [107](#)
 Muḥammad ("Mitaometto"), Turkish commander (d. 1346), [204](#)

- Munich (München), 172
- Muntaner, Ramón, Catalan chronicler (d. 1336?), 441, 442, 445, 450
- Murad I, son of Orkhan; Ottoman ruler 1362–1389: 246n, 300, 312, 321, 341, 459
- Murta, Giovanni, doge of Genoa 1344–1350: 197, 206, 210n
- Musa, son of Bayazid I; contender for Ottoman sultanate 1402–1413: 306n, 326, 376–378, 380
- Musard, Richard, Savoyard crusader (in 1366), 293
- Mustafa, son of Bayazid I (d. 1402?), 376n
- Muwahhids ("Almohads"), Berber sect and caliphal dynasty in North Africa and Spain 1130–1269: 330, 331
- Muzalon, George, regent at Nicaea (d. 1258), 72, 76
- Mykonos, 326; lords of, *see* Ghisi
- Mytilene, archbishop of, *see* Philip; island of, *see* Lesbos
- Namur, 63; count of, *see* Philip of Courtenay; county of, 44, 65, 66n
- Nani da S. Vitale, Venetian family, 323
- Naples (Napoli), 81n, 105, 109, 112, 130, 137, 138, 141, 144, 146–148, 150, 159, 160n, 179, 188, 194, 199n, 208, 214, 241, 279, 315, 316n, 335, 338, 339, 364, 436, 454, and *see* Bérard of Naples; archbishop of, *see* Pierre d'Ameil; Bay of, 148, 312; merchants from, 337
- Naples, kingdom of ("Sicily;" the Regno), 98, 141, 143, 150, 154, 158–160, 165, 170, 171, 178n, 179, 183, 188, 196, 197n, 199–201, 208, 210, 218, 237, 243, 259, 294, 325, 328, 342, 384, 435, 436, 458n; grand seneschals of, *see* Niccolò and Angelo Acciajuoli; kings and queens of, *see* Angevins 1266–1442
- Narbonne, archbishop of, *see* Pierre
- Narjot of Toucy, regent of the Latin empire 1228–1231, 1238–1241: 54
- Narzotto dalle Carceri, son of Ravano's nephew Marino I; triarch of Euboea 1247–1264: 78–80, 83, 91, 95, 425; wife of, *see* Felisa (da Verona)
- Nasi, Joseph, duke of Naxos 1566–1579: 19n
- an-Nāṣir Muḥammad, Nāṣir ad-Dīn, son of Kalavun; Bahri Mamluk sultan of Egypt and Syria 1293–1294, 1299–1309, 1310–1341: 167, 266
- Naṣrids, Arab dynasty at Granada 1232–1492: 330
- Naupactus, *see* Lepanto
- Nauplia, 20n, 24, 25, 36, 37, 68, 79, 99n, 154, 155, 204, 298, 326, 405, 421, 427, 428, 432–434, 440, 448, 452, 472n; archon of, *see* L. Sgourus; lords of, *see* Argos, lords of
- Navarino, Old, *see* Port-de-Jonc
- Navarre, 373; Hospitaller prior of, *see* Garin de Châteauneuf; kings of, *see* Philip III (of Évreux) 1328–1343, Charles II 1349–1387, Charles III 1387–1425; mercenaries from ("Navarrese Company"), 162, 466–469, 471
- Navigajoso, Paolo, son-in-law of Angelo Sanudo; "grand duke" of Lemnos (in 1260), 91
- Naxos, 18, 19n, 221, 233, 258, 431, 432; archbishops of, 149, 186, and *see* Bernard, Thomas; duchy of ("the Archipelago"), 18, 19n, 68, 155, 247n, 377; dukes of, 31, and *see* Sanudi 1207–1371, Niccolò dalle Carceri 1371–1383, Crispi 1383–1566, J. Nasi 1566–1579
- Necropolis Gate (Bāb al-Khaukhah, in Alexandria), 269
- Nectarius (Niccolò of Otranto), abbot of Casole (d. 1235), 58
- Negroponte (Chalcis, Euripos), 29, 35n, 39, 49n, 66, 78, 79n, 80, 95, 145n, 150n, 180, 188, 191, 197, 201, 202, 204–206, 212, 213, 216, 220, 250n, 297, 298, 300, 307, 308n, 323, 324n, 342, 344n, 357, 358n, 389, 392, 399, 408, 409, 415, 418, 426–428, 429n, 433, 448–450, 453, 459, 462, 464; island of, *see* Euboea; Latin bishops of, 50n, 70, 96, 258, 419, and *see* Theodore, Gautier de Ray; Venetian bailies at, 424, 430, 454, and *see* Pietro Barbo 1216–1218, L. Sanudo 1252–1254, Paolo Gradenigo 1254–1256, Marco Gradenigo 1256–1258, A. Barozzi 1258–1259, T. Giustinian 1259–1261, N. M. Rosso 1278–1280, N. Giustinian 1291–1293, F. Dandolo 1317–1319, M. Minotto 1325–1327, P. Zeno 1331–1333, M. Soranzo 1345–1347, Pietro Gradenigo 1362–1364, D. Michiel 1364–1366, Pantaleone Barbo 1379–1381, A. Bembo 1393–1395, F. Bembo 1401–1402, 1405–1408; Venetians of, 185, 193n, 440n, 453, 454, 457
- Nemanyids, royal dynasty in Serbia 1170–1371: 52, and *see* Stephen Urosh I 1242–1276, Stephen Dragutin 1276–1282, Stephen Urosh II Milutin 1282–1321, Stephen Urosh IV Dushan 1331–1355, Stephen Urosh V 1355–1371; *see also* Constantine Tich (Bulgaria 1357–1377)
- Neopatras (Hypate), 45, 59, 87, 89, 129, 258, 423–426, 443, 444, 451, 452n, 456n, 459, 461, 464–466, 471; "Council" of (1276), 129, 130n; "duchy" of, 25n, 156n, 422, 424, 442–445, 451n, 455, 458–461, 465, 466, 468, 469n; dukes of (1319–1394), *see* Athens, dukes of; Latin archbishops of, 40, 47, 186, 406, 410, 411n, 461, 464, and *see* Ferrer d'Abella (bishop), J. Mascó, P. Fabri, Francis, Matthew, John de Royis; lords of, *see* Ducae
- Neophytus, Greek (*fl.* 1238), 65, 419
- Neri (or Negri), Giuliano, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), 294n, 295n, 302
- Nerio of Montferrat, son of Guglielmo III; Byzantine caesar 1179–1183: 16, 17; wife of, *see* Maria (Comnena)
- Nestongus, Isaac, Byzantine official (*fl.* 1257), 76
- Nestorians, sect, 97n, and *see* Mar Jabalaha, Rabban Sauma
- Nestus, river, 83n
- Neutra (Nitra), bishop of, *see* Stephen de Insula
- Nevers, 232, 368; count of, *see* John of Nevers
- Nicaea (Iznik), 2n, 52, 57, 62n, 63, 71, 75, 76, 83, 90, 143, 166n, 225n, 415, 416, 419; emperors at, 1, 55n, and *see* Lascarids, Michael VIII Palaeologus; empire of, 13n, 18, 43, 44, 52, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 67–77, 81–84, 90, 178n; Orthodox metropolitan of, *see* Theophanes; Orthodox patriarchs at, *see* Constantinople; Second Council of (787), 41
- Niccoli, Baldassano, Genoese notary (*fl.* 1367), 309
- Niccolò (of Durazzo), bishop of Cotrone 1254–d. after 1264: 100
- Niccolò II d'Este, lord of Ferrara 1361–1388: 372
- Niccolò di Castro Arquato, Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1234–1251: 66, 67, 71, 429, 463
- Niccolò of Otranto, *see* Nectarius
- Nice (Nizza), 202, 203, 208
- Nicephorus I Ducas, son of Michael II and Theodora; despot of Epirus *ca.* 1267–1296: 59n, 60, 73, 76, 82n, 87, 88, 90, 129–131, 136n, 422, 423n, 424, 425, 435, 436, 438; wives of, *see* Maria (Lascaris), Anna "Palaeologina"
- Nicetas II Muntanes, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1186–1189: 415n
- Nicholas, archbishop of Gran (Esztergom) 1358–*ca.* 1366: 289
- Nicholas, Augustinian; bishop of Andros 1349–d. by 1376: 457n
- Nicholas (Alberti of Prato), cardinal 1303–1321: 449
- Nicholas, Orthodox metropolitan of Corinth (d. *ca.* 1205), 24n
- Nicholas III (Giovanni Gaetano Orsini), cardinal 1244–1277, pope 1277–1280: 113n, 115n, 123, 125, 126, 128–135, 139
- Nicholas IV (Jerome Masci of Ascoli), cardinal 1278–1288, pope 1288–1292: 111, 112, 113n, 124–126, 147, 163, 169

- "Nicholas V," antipope 1328–1330, *see* P. Rainallucci da Corbara
- Nicholas, titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1308–?1331: [158](#), [447](#), [452](#)
- Nicholas d'Astribort, envoy (in 1345), [198](#)
- Nicholas de Ardoino, veguer of Thebes (*fl.* 1375), [444](#)
- Nicholas de Kanizsa, brother of John; Hungarian magnate (*fl.* 1395), [343n](#)
- Nicholas de Mathafaris, archbishop of Zara 1333–*ca.* 1367: [289](#)
- Nicholas de Raynaldo, Latin archbishop of Athens 1357–*d.* by 1365: [457](#), [463](#)
- Nicholas I Mysticus, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 901–907, 912–925: [37n](#)
- Nicholas of Butrinto, Italian chronicler (*fl.* 1313), [170n](#)
- Nicholas of Chalcedon, Orthodox preacher (*fl.* 1275), [120](#)
- Nicholas of Luxemburg, patriarch of Aquileia 1350–1358: [229n](#)
- Nicholas I of S. Omer, Frankish baron (*fl.* 1215), [40](#), [414n](#), [418n](#); wife of, *see* Margaret (of Hungary)
- Nicholas II of S. Omer, son of Bela and Bonne; lord of half Thebes *ca.* 1258–1294, Angevin bailie of Achaea 1287–1289: [127n](#), [417](#), [420n](#), [433](#), [434n](#); wife of, *see* Anna (Ducaena)
- Nicholas III of S. Omer, nephew of Nicholas II; lord of half Thebes 1299–1311, bailie of Achaea 1300–1302, 1304–1307 (*d.* 1314), [151](#), [437–440](#)
- Nicole de Brohom, Augustinian friar (*fl.* 1363), [248](#)
- Nicomedia (Izmit), [52](#), [371](#)
- Nikopolis (Nikopol), crusade of (1396), [293](#), [342–367](#), [375](#), [379](#), [382](#), [385](#), [400](#), [403](#), [404](#), [472n](#)
- Nicosia, [229](#), [237n](#), [238](#), [241](#), [265n](#), [272](#), [273](#), [382](#), [383](#), [386](#); archbishops of, *see* Philippe de Chambarlhac, Raymond de la Pradèle
- Nikli (Amyclae), [25](#), [26](#), [31](#), [48](#), [99](#), [127](#), [421](#), [433](#); Latin bishops of, [38](#)
- Nile, river, [266](#), [267](#), [271](#), [276](#), [279](#)
- Nîmes, [218](#), [230](#)
- Niphon, Melkite (Orthodox) patriarch of Alexandria 1366–1385: [310](#)
- Nish, [329](#)
- Nivernais, [232](#)
- Nogaret, *see* Guillaume de Nogaret
- Nona, [228](#)
- Normandy (Normandie), [208n](#), [246](#), [332](#); dukes of, *see* Robert II, John (II of France), Charles (V of France)
- Normans, [107n](#), [332](#); of Sicily, [102](#), [132](#), [331](#)
- North Africa (al-Maghrib), [140n](#), [331](#), [332](#), [454](#), [455n](#); *see also* Algeria, Morocco, Tripolitania, Tunisia
- Norway, [110n](#)
- Novara, [27n](#)
- Novelles, family, [443](#), and *see* Odo de Novelles
- Novgorod, [73n](#)
- Novigrad, [403](#)
- Nuremberg (Nürnberg), burgrave of, *see* John III; chronicler of, *see* U. Stromer
- an-Nuwairī al-Iskandarī, Arabic chronicler (*fl.* 1365), [268](#), [270](#), [272](#)
- Nychodi, Andrea, of Mesembria (*fl.* 1366), [304](#)
- Nymphaeum, [61](#), [72](#), [91](#), [100](#)
- Oberto, count of Biandrate, regent of Thessalonica 1207–1211: [27–29](#)
- Obizzo III d'Este, lord of Ferrara (*d.* 1352), [199](#), [210n](#)
- Ochrida (Achrida), [43](#), [72](#), [74](#), [76](#), [85](#), [87](#); Orthodox archbishops of, [85](#), and *see* D. Chomatianus, G. Coccinus
- Ocko, John, bishop of Olmütz 1351–1364: [229n](#)
- Octolinas, Constantine, of Mesembria (*fl.* 1366), [304](#)
- Oddino, Latin bishop of Chios 1343–1349: [215](#)
- Odo, bishop of Paphos 1337–1357: [229](#)
- Odo III, duke of Burgundy 1192–1218: [7](#)
- Odo IV, son of Robert II; duke of Burgundy 1315–1349: [179](#)
- Odo de Novelles, vicar-general of Athens (in 1331), [453](#)
- Odo of Deuil, French chronicler (*ca.* 1150), [9n](#)
- Oeta, Mount, [22](#)
- Ogerius (Ogier), Byzantine official (*fl.* 1278), [128](#), [130n](#), [144](#), [423n](#), [425](#)
- Ogier VIII d'Anglure, French pilgrim (*fl.* 1395), [347n](#)
- Ogliastro, [338](#)
- Ögödei, great khan of the Mongols 1227–1242: [61](#)
- Olena, [48](#), [150](#); Latin bishops of, [38](#), [70](#), and *see* Leonard
- Öljeitü, son of Arghun; il-khan of Persia 1304–1316: [167n](#)
- Öller, Michael, dean of Thebes (*d.* 1362), [456](#), [457](#)
- Olmütz (Olomouc), bishop of, *see* J. Ocko
- Olt, river, [349](#)
- Opicinus de Canistris, Pavian polemicist (*d. ca.* 1334), [171](#)
- Orange, [218](#), [232](#)
- Ordelauffi, ruling family at Forlì (to 1500), [172](#), [231](#)
- Order of the Collar, [285](#), [293](#), [302n](#); of the Sword, [238](#)
- Oreos (Histiaea), [18](#), [19](#), [35](#), [78](#), [80](#), [82](#), [408](#), [409](#), [415](#), [426](#), [462](#); lord of, [78](#)
- Oresme, Nicole, French writer (*d.* 1382), [173](#), [174](#)
- Orkhan, son of Osman; Ottoman ruler 1326–1362: [225n](#), [246n](#), [312n](#)
- Orléans, duke of, [212n](#), and *see* Louis I 1391–1407
- Orsini, Roman family, [123](#), [125](#), [133](#), [134](#), [139](#), and *see* Nicholas III (Giovanni Gaetano Orsini); palace of, [315](#); *see also* Cephalonia, counts of
- Orsini, John II, grandson of Riccardo; count of Cephalonia and despot of Epirus 1323–1335: [452](#)
- Orsini, Matteo (Maio), son-in-law of Margaritone of Brindisi; count of Cephalonia and Zante 1194–*d.* by 1260: [3](#), [59](#), [65](#)
- Orsini, Napoleone, cardinal 1288–1342: [174](#), [175](#), [465n](#)
- Orsini, Riccardo, son of Matteo; count of Cephalonia and Zante by 1260–1304, bailie of Achaea 1297–1300: [91](#), [435n](#); wife of, *see* Marguerite of Villehardouin
- Orso, Lorenzo, Venetian merchant (*fl.* 1403), [388](#), [389](#)
- Orsova, [348](#)
- Orthodox, or Eastern, Christians (Greeks, "schismatics"), [1](#), [10](#), [14](#), [48](#), [49](#), [52](#), [58](#), [66](#), [71](#), [99](#)–[103](#), [107](#)–[112](#), [114](#)–[120](#), [122](#), [125](#), [130](#), [134](#), [135](#), [150](#), [166](#), [177](#), [178](#), [213](#), [237](#), [250](#), [259](#), [287](#)–[289](#), [302](#), [309](#), [314](#), [327](#), [367](#), [372](#), [373](#), [400](#), [407](#), [410](#), [411](#), [413](#), [419](#), [425](#), [446](#)–[448](#), [456](#), [463](#), [468](#), [471](#)
- Ortona, [82n](#)
- Orvieto, [96n](#), [110](#), [134](#), [135](#), [138](#), and *see* Angelo d'Orvieto; bishop of, *see* Constantine
- Osman, Ottoman ruler (*d.* 1326), [2n](#)
- Osmanli Turks, *see* Ottomans
- Ostia and Velletri, cardinal-bishops of, [224](#), and *see* Nicholas, Bertrand du Poujet, A. Acciajuoli; *see also* Gregory IX, Alexander IV, Innocent V, Benedict XI, Innocent VI
- Osum, river, [350](#)
- Othon de Cicon, son of Jacques and Sibylle; lord of Carystus 1250–*ca.* 1264: [78](#), [80](#), [95](#), [418](#), [426n](#); wife of, *see* Agnese Ghisi
- Othon de la Roche, brother of Guy I; bailie of Athens 1259–1260: [83](#), [421](#)
- Othon de la Roche, son of Ponce; great lord of Athens 1204–1225 (*d.* 1234), [16](#), [28](#), [29](#), [36](#), [37](#), [39](#), [40](#), [46](#)–[49](#), [51](#), [405](#)–[409](#), [411n](#), [412](#)–[419](#), [422n](#), [462](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle de Ray
- Othon de la Roche, son of Othon and Isabelle; lord of Ray (from 1234), [417](#), [418](#)

- Othon of S. Omer, son of Bela and Bonne; lord of half Thebes 1294–1299: [435](#)
- Otranto, [58](#), [130](#), [253](#), [404](#); archbishops of, *see* John, J. Campanus d'Itri
- Otrar, [376](#)
- Otto I ("the Great"), king of Germany 936–962, emperor 962–973: [1](#), [171](#)
- Otto IV, of Brunswick, Welf king of Germany 1201–1209, emperor 1209–1211 (d. 1218), [5](#), [114](#), [171](#)
- Ottobono di Groppo (or Greppo), Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Ottokar II Přemysl, king of Bohemia 1253–1278: [111](#), [114n](#), [128](#); wife of, *see* Kunigunde
- Ottomans (Osmanli), Turkish caliphal dynasty 1299–1923: [2](#), [3](#), [19n](#), [36](#), [143](#), [155](#), [166n](#), [174](#), [182n](#), [225–227](#), [231](#), [233](#), [234](#), [237](#), [239n](#), [245n](#), [246n](#), [259](#), [286–288](#), [300](#), [312](#), [326](#), [329](#), [330n](#), [341](#), [343](#), [348](#), [350](#), [352](#), [360](#), [371](#), [376](#), [377](#), [400](#), [402–404](#), [459n](#), [471](#), and *see* Turks; rulers, *see* Osman (d. 1326), Orkhan 1326–1362, Murad I 1362–1389; sultans, *see* Bayazid I 1389–1402, Mehmed I (1402) 1413–1421, Mehmed II 1451–1481, Bayazid II 1481–1512, Selim II 1566–1574; *see also* Isa, Musa, Mustafa, Suleiman
- Oudenarde, [366](#)
- Oulx, castellan of, [197](#)
- Pachomeus I, Melkite (Orthodox) patriarch of Antioch by 1359–1368, 1375–1377, 1378–1386: [310](#)
- Pachymeres, George, Byzantine official and historian (d. *ca.* 1310), [2n](#), [69](#), [81](#), [86](#), [88](#), [90](#), [92](#), [93](#), [101–103](#), [107n](#), [119](#), [120](#), [122](#), [131n](#), [132](#), [423](#), [424n](#), [427](#)
- Padua (Padova), [90n](#), [190](#), [210n](#), [243](#), [308n](#), [352](#), [372](#), [391](#), [396](#), [403](#), and *see* Fidenzio and Marsiglio of Padua; bishop of (Hildebrand de' Conti 1319–1352), [208](#), and *see* J. Zeno: lords of, *see* Carraresi
- Paenonia, [45](#)
- Pag, [403](#)
- Palaeologi, Byzantine imperial dynasty at Nicaea 1259–1261 and Constantinople 1261–1453: [85](#), [126](#), [127](#), [164](#), [189](#), [239n](#), [312n](#), [321](#), [322](#), [424](#), [441](#), and *see* Michael VIII (1259) 1261–1282, Andronicus II (1272) 1282–1328, Michael IX (1294–1320), Andronicus III (1316) 1328–1341, John V 1341–1347, 1354–1376, 1379–1390, 1390–1391, Andronicus IV (1355) 1376–1379, John VII in 1390, Manuel II (1373) 1391–1425, John VIII (1421) 1425–1448, Constantine XI (1448) 1449–1453; at Mistra, *see* Theodore I 1382–1407, Theodore II 1415–1428 (1443), Andronicus (1423–1429), Thomas (1428–1432, prince of Achaia 1432–1460), Constantine [XI] (1428) 1443–1448, Demetrius 1449–1460; at Montferrat, *see* Theodore II 1381–1418; at Thessalonica, *see* Andronicus 1408–1423; *see also* Eulogia, John, and Maria ([2](#)), and Andronicus Palaeologus Asen
- Palaeologus, Andronicus, governor of Thessalonica (in 1247), [69](#)
- Palaeologus, Demetrius, cousin of Manuel II; Byzantine envoy (in 1401), [375](#)
- Palaeologus, Demetrius, son of Manuel II and Helena; despot at Mistra 1449–1460 (d. 1470), [162](#)
- Palaeologus, John, brother of Michael VIII; sebastocrator 1258–1259, despot 1259–1261, ruler of Rhodes 1261–1275: [85–90](#), [423](#), [424](#)
- Palaeologus, Michael, son of John V and Helena (*fl.* 1366), [288](#)
- Palaeologus, Theodore I, son of John V and Helena; despot at Mistra 1382–1407: [162](#), [322](#), [372](#), [379](#), [380](#), [382](#)
- Palaeologus, Theodore II, son of Manuel II and Helena; despot at Mistra 1415–1428, co-despot 1428–1443: [372](#)
- Palaeologus, Thomas, son of Manuel II and Helena; co-despot at Mistra (1418) 1428–1432, prince of Achaia 1432–1460, claimant to Byzantine throne 1453–1465: [162](#)
- Palamas, Gregory, Greek hesychast (*fl.* 1346), [189](#), [225n](#), [310n](#)
- Palamidi, [24](#)
- Palazzo Vecchio (in Florence), [184n](#)
- Palermo, [81n](#), [140](#), [258](#), [335n](#), [338](#), [446](#)
- Pallavicini, Italian family, [416n](#)
- Pallavicini, Alberto, Italian baron (*fl.* 1208), [28n](#)
- Pallavicini, Guglielma, granddaughter of Thomas; marchioness of Boudonitza, wife of B. Zaccaria (to *ca.* 1333), wife of Niccolò I Giorgio 1335–1345 (d. 1357), [181n](#), [202](#), [454](#)
- Pallavicini, Guido, marquis (margrave) of Boudonitza 1204–1237: [27n](#), [28](#), [40](#), [50](#), [416](#)
- Pallavicini, Thomas, cousin of Ubertino; marquis (margrave) of Boudonitza (from 1286), [433](#), [434](#)
- Pallavicini, Ubertino (Oberto), son of Guido; marquis (margrave) of Boudonitza 1237–*ca.* 1278: [79](#), [83](#), [87n](#), [420n](#)
- Pallene, [190](#), [191](#)
- Palliat, cook (d. 1367), [304](#), [307](#)
- Pamisos, river, [433](#)
- Pamplona, [373](#)
- Panidus, [321](#)
- Pansa, Lanfranco, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#), [304](#)
- Pantaléon, Jacques, *see* Urban IV
- Pantokrator, church of the (at Constantinople), [94n](#)
- Paolo da Venezia, interpreter (*fl.* 1366), [301](#)
- Paolo di Banca, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#)
- Paphlagonia, soldiers from, [74n](#), [75](#)
- Paphos, [242](#), [279](#), [382](#), [383](#); bishop of, *see* Odo
- Parastron, John, Franciscan (d. 1275), [110](#), [111](#), [115](#), [119](#)
- Parenzo (Poreč), [364](#), [365](#), [382n](#), [385](#)
- Paris, [38](#), [61n](#), [106n](#), [146](#), [147](#), [148n](#), [170](#), [177](#), [179](#), [208](#), [211](#), [212](#), [232](#), [241](#), [244n](#), [245n](#), [249](#), [253](#), [273](#), [333](#), [346](#), [347](#), [359](#), [360](#), [362](#), [363](#), [366](#), [369](#), [372](#), [374–376](#), [393](#), [394n](#), [398](#), [399](#), [402](#), [421](#), [434](#); bishop of, [211](#), and *see* E. Tempier; church of, [407](#); MS. at, [155n](#), [157](#); university of, [20](#), [123n](#), [147](#), [259](#)
- Paris, Matthew, *see* Matthew Paris
- Parma, [416n](#), and *see* Barnaba da Parma, John and Salimbene of Parma
- Parnassus, mountain, [439](#)
- Parnon, Mount, [26](#), [31](#), [63](#), [68](#)
- Paros, [19n](#); Latin archbishops of, [149](#), and *see* Bernard, Thomas
- Parthenon, cathedral (S. Mary of Athens) on the Acropolis, [23](#), [29](#), [46](#), [47](#), [49](#), [66](#), [407](#), [408](#), [417](#), [432](#), [463](#), [464](#), [467](#), [471](#), [473](#)
- Paruta, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Pasqualigo di Candia, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Passagium generale, *see* Crusades
- Passau, [347](#)
- Passavá (Passavant), [31](#), [127](#), and *see* Marguerite de Passavant
- Paterio, Bernardo, brother of Niccolò; Genoese (*fl.* 1397), [366](#)
- Paterio, Niccolò, Genoese podestà (in 1397), [363](#), [366](#), [368](#)
- Patmos, [385](#)
- Patras, [20n](#), [24](#), [25](#), [38](#), [48](#), [66](#), [82](#), [83](#), [161](#), [190n](#), [207](#), [233](#), [258](#), [326](#), [452](#), [457n](#), [458](#); barony of, [31](#), [32n](#), [154](#); Latin archbishops of, [31](#), [37](#), [38](#), [64](#), [96](#), [159](#), [186](#), [308](#), and *see* Antelmus, John, G. Frangipani, Roger, G. Acciajuoli, Bartolommeo de' Papazzurri, A. Acciajuoli, P. Foscari

- Patrasso, Leonardo, cardinal 1300–1311: [151](#)
 Patricelli, Pietro (of Fano), Franciscan; papal vicar at Smyrna (in 1363), [247](#)
 Patti, [227](#); and Lipari, bishop of, *see* Pierre Thomas
 Paulus, Latin archbishop of Smyrna 1345–1357, archbishop of Thebes 1357–1366, titular patriarch of Constantinople 1366–1370: [216](#), [217](#), [225](#), [226](#), [259](#), [298](#), [301](#), [303–306](#), [308](#), [310–312](#), [313n](#), [457–459](#), [470](#)
 Pavia, [53](#), [171](#), [243](#), [291–293](#), [308n](#), [372](#), [453](#), and *see* Gregory of Pavia; bishop of, *see* L. Tacconi; tyrants of, *see* G. Visconti 1354–1378, G. G. Visconti 1378–1402, F. M. Visconti 1402–1412
 Peasants' Revolt (1381), [173](#)
 Pedro III, son of James I; king of Aragon-Catalonia 1276–1285, king (Peter I) of Sicily 1282–1285: [108](#), [128](#), [138–141](#), [144–146](#), [148n](#), [446](#); wife of, *see* Constance (Hohenstaufen)
 Pedro IV ("the Ceremonious"), son of Alfonso IV; king of Aragon-Catalonia 1336–1387, duke of Athens 1380–1387: [188](#), [189n](#), [229](#), [330n](#), [454–456](#), [457n](#), [460](#), [461n](#), [463n](#), [465–469](#); wife of, *see* Eleanora of Sicily
 Pedro de Pau, vicar-general of Athens 1387–1388: [464n](#)
 Pedro de Pou, vicar-general of Athens 1361–1362: [456](#), [459](#); wife of, *see* Angelina
 Pedro ("Bordo") de San Superano, vicar of Achaea 1386–1391, prince of Achaea 1396–1402: [162](#); wife of, *see* Maria Zaccaria
 Pegae, [60](#), [91](#)
 Peking (Khanbaliq), [133](#)
 Pelagius (Galvani), cardinal 1205–1230: [39](#), [42](#), [414](#)
 Pelagonia, [62](#), [74](#), [85](#), [87](#); battle of (1259), [36n](#), [88–90](#), [98](#), [137](#), [422](#), [423](#), [427n](#)
 Pellegrino, Bartolommeo, Genoese merchant (*fl.* 1397), [362](#)
 Pellegrino de' Bracelli, notary (*fl.* 1346), [207n](#)
 Pepoli, ruling family at Bologna 1337–1350: [188](#), [197](#), and *see* Giacomo, Giovanni, and Taddeo de' Pepoli
 Pepper Gate (or S. Mark's Gate, at Alexandria), [271](#)
 Pera (Beyoghlu), [131](#), [164n](#), [222](#), [258](#), [294n](#), [295](#), [302–307](#), [309–311](#), [313](#), [315](#), [317](#), [321](#), [324](#), [360](#), [362](#), [363](#), [378](#), [382](#), [384n](#), [385](#), [391](#), [394](#); Genoese podestà of, [301](#), [306](#), [309](#), [358](#), [366](#)
 Percival of Cologne, chamberlain of Cyprus (in 1365), [266](#), [267](#), [269](#), [270](#)
 Périgord, [259](#), and *see* É. Talleyrand of Périgord
 Périgueux, [232](#)
 Perpignan, [397](#)
 Persia (Iran), [146](#), [147](#), [270](#), [348n](#); Mongols of, [3](#), [108n](#), [113](#), [116](#), [266](#), and *see* Il-khans
 Perugia, [54](#), [163](#), [197](#), [204](#), [308n](#), and *see* Andrea and Filippo da Perugia
 Pescatore, Enrico, Genoese count of Malta (in 1210), [19n](#)
 Peter, *see also* Pedro, Petrus, Piero, Pierre, Pietro
 Peter III, bishop of Antioch 1052–1056: [117n](#)
 Peter II, son of Frederick II; king of Sicily 1337–1342: [170](#)
 Peter (Correr), titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1286–1302: [150](#), [151](#)
 Peter of Courtenay, brother-in-law of Henry d'Angre; Latin emperor in 1217 (d. 1219?), [41n](#), [44](#), [45](#), [50](#), [51](#), [53](#); wife of, *see* Yolande (of Hainaut)
 Peter I of Lusignan, son of Hugh IV; king of Cyprus (1358) 1359–1369, of Cilician Armenia 1368–1369: [237–254](#), [258–272](#), [274–288](#), [293](#), [294](#), [307](#), [328](#), [339n](#), [362](#), [387](#), [458](#); wife of, *see* Eleanor (of Aragon)
 Peter II of Lusignan, son of Peter I and Eleanor; king of Cyprus 1369–1382: [282](#), [328](#), [382](#), [383](#)
 Petraliphas (Petraliphina), *see* Maria and Theodora Petraliphas
 Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca), Italian poet and humanist (d. 1374), [159](#), [177](#), [213](#), [242](#), [254](#), [255](#), [260n](#), [278](#), [290](#), [300n](#), [470n](#)
 Petrus de Lutra, 14th-century polemicist, [171](#)
 Phanarion, [438](#), [439](#)
 Pharos Island, peninsula (at Alexandria), [267](#), [269–271](#)
 Pharsala, [60](#), [426](#), [442](#), [451](#)
 Philadelphia (Alashehir), [224](#), [225](#), [341](#)
 Philagrios, Orthodox bishop of Adramereus (in 1213), [30](#)
 Philes, Theodore, Byzantine noble (*fl.* 1259), [84](#)
 Philibert de Naillac, grand master of the Hospitallers 1396–1421: [326](#), [356](#), [360n](#), [385](#), [386](#), [388](#)
 Philip II ("Augustus"), Capetian king of France 1180–1223: [51](#); wall of, [402](#)
 Philip III ("the Bold"), son of Louis IX; Capetian king of France 1270–1285: [110n](#), [123](#), [126](#), [128](#), [144](#), [146](#)
 Philip IV ("the Fair"), son of Philip III; Capetian king of France 1285–1314: [143](#), [146](#), [147](#), [152n](#), [153](#), [163](#), [164n](#), [165](#), [167–170](#), [448n](#)
 Philip V ("the Tall"), son of Philip IV; regent 1316–1317, Capetian king of France 1317–1322: [452](#)
 Philip VI (of Valois), son of Charles of Valois; Capetian king of France 1328–1350: [159](#), [172](#), [178–181](#), [189n](#), [191–195](#), [206n](#), [208](#), [211](#), [212n](#), [337](#); wife of, *see* Joan of Burgundy
 Philip II ("the Bold"), son of John II of France; duke of Burgundy 1363–1404, count of Flanders 1384–1404: [329](#), [332](#), [340](#), [343–347](#), [359](#), [362–368](#), [393](#), [401](#), [402](#); wife of, *see* Margaret of Flanders
 Philip III ("the Good"), son of John of Nevers; duke of Burgundy 1419–1467: [402](#), [403](#)
 Philip II, Hapsburg king of Spain 1556–1598: [316n](#)
 Philip, Latin archbishop of Mytilene by 1345–1353: [200](#), [201](#), [205](#)
 Philip, Carmelite; Latin bishop of Salona 1332–1342, archbishop of Thebes 1342–1351, archbishop of Conza 1351–1356: [186](#), [188](#), [206](#), [455](#), [462](#)
 Philip, papal official (*fl.* 1238), [64](#)
 Philip of Anjou, son of Charles I (d. 1277), [104](#), [123](#), [127](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle of Villehardouin
 Philip of Courtenay, son of Baldwin II; titular Latin emperor of Constantinople 1273–1283: [105](#), [112n](#), [119](#), [124](#), [129n](#), [130](#), [134](#), [135](#), [139n](#), [164n](#), [168n](#), [435n](#); wife of, *see* Beatrice of Anjou
 Philip of Courtenay, son of Peter; count of Namur 1218–1226: [44](#)
 Philip III of Évreux, nephew of Philip IV of France; king of Navarre 1328–1343: [179](#)
 Philip of Lagonesse, Angevin bailie of Achaea 1280–1282: [127n](#); wife of, *see* Mahaut of Hainaut
 Philip of Savoy, nephew of Amadeo V; count of Piedmont, prince of Achaea 1301–1306 (1307, d. 1334), [143](#), [151–153](#), [439](#), [440](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle of Villehardouin
 Philip of Swabia, son of Frederick I; Hohenstaufen duke of Swabia and Alsace 1196–1208: [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#); wife of, *see* Irene (Angelina)
 Philip I of Taranto, son of Charles II of Anjou; Angevin prince of Achaea 1307–1313, titular Latin emperor of Constantinople 1313–1331: [150–153](#), [154n](#), [158](#), [159](#), [164n](#), [165](#), [179](#), [435](#), [436](#), [438](#), [440](#), [446](#), [449n](#); [452](#); wives of, *see* Thamar of Epirus, Catherine of Valois
 Philip II of Taranto, son of Philip I and Catherine; titular Latin emperor of Constantinople and prince of Achaea 1364–1373: [161](#), [199n](#), [297](#), [315](#), [459](#); wife of, *see* Maria of Anjou
 Philippe d'Artois, brother of Robert; constable of France,

- count of Eu 1387–1397: [335](#), [344](#), [345](#), [347–349](#), [351](#), [353–355](#), [360](#), [375](#); wife of, *see* Marie
- Philippe de Bar, son of Robert; French crusader (d. 1396), [345](#), [349](#), [354](#)
- Philippe de Chamberlhac, archbishop of Nicosia 1342–1360, archbishop of Bordeaux 1360–1361: [186](#), [217](#), [222](#), [265n](#)
- Philippe de Mézières, chancellor of Cyprus (in 1365), French writer (d. 1405), [174](#), [228n](#), [229n](#), [236–238](#), [241–244](#), [246](#), [247](#), [249n](#), [252](#), [253](#), [259–261](#), [263](#), [264](#), [266–268](#), [270n](#), [271–273](#), [278n](#), [280](#), [281](#), [283](#), [284](#), [296n](#), [308](#), [331](#), [332](#), [340](#), [351n](#), [366](#), [367](#), [370](#), [394n](#)
- Philippopolis (Plovdiv), [55](#), [300](#), [350](#), [358](#)
- Philotheus Coccinus, Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople 1353–1354, 1364–1376: [298n](#), [309–311](#), [320](#)
- Philotrophinus, Manuel, Byzantine envoy (in 1395), [346](#)
- Phocaea (Foglia), Old, [191n](#), [207](#); New, [182](#), [207](#), [362](#), [363](#), [377](#)
- Phocis, [90](#), [438](#), [466](#)
- Photius, patriarch of Constantinople 858–867, 877–886: [1](#)
- Phthiotis, [442](#)
- Phyle (Felin), [408](#)
- Piacenza, [107](#), [308](#), [416n](#)
- Piada, [159n](#)
- Piancarpino (Plano Carpini, now Pian del Carpine), *see* Giovanni de Piancarpino
- Piazza S. Marco (in Venice), [256](#), [260n](#)
- Picardy, [207](#), [241](#)
- Piccati, Simone, Florentine interpreter (*fl.* 1348), [217](#), [218](#)
- Piccolomini, Italian family, [129n](#), and *see* Pius II (Eneo Silvio Piccolomini)
- Piedmont (Piemonte), [291](#), [292](#); count of, *see* Philip of Savoy
- Piero di Gieri (de' Corieri), innkeeper and courier-master (*fl.* 1350), [215n](#)
- Pierre, archbishop of Narbonne 1347–1375: [232](#)
- Pierre I (of Clermont), son of Louis I; duke of Bourbon 1342–1356: [195](#), [297n](#)
- Pierre d' Aigrefeuille, bishop of Vabres 1347–1349: [469](#)
- Pierre d' Ameil, archbishop of Naples 1363–1365, cardinal (Avignone) 1378–1389: [241n](#), [294n](#)
- Pierre d' Aulps (Pietro d' Alifa), Hellenized Norman (*fl.* 1107), [59n](#)
- Pierre de Charny, archbishop of Sens 1268–1274: [110n](#)
- Pierre de Corneillan, master of the Hospitallers 1353–1355: [224n](#), [229](#), [230](#)
- Pierre de Cros, nephew of Clement VI; cardinal 1350–1361: [456](#), [465](#)
- Pierre I de Dreux, count of Brittany 1213–1237 (d. 1250), [64](#), [65n](#)
- Pierre de l' Isle, Angevin envoy (in 1291), [435](#)
- Pierre de la Palu, lord of Varambon (*fl.* 1345), [193](#)
- Pierre de la Roche, castellan of the Acropolis 1230–?1233: [417](#)
- Pierre de Tarentaise, *see* Innocent V
- Pierre Thomas, Carmelite; bishop of Patti and Lipari 1354–1359, bishop of Coron 1359–1363, archbishop of Crete 1363–1364, titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1364–1366: [174](#), [226–229](#), [231n](#), [233–248](#), [250](#), [252](#), [253](#), [258–261](#), [263–268](#), [269n](#), [271–274](#), [284](#), [298n](#), [457](#)
- Pietro da Canale, Venetian diplomat (*fl.* 1332), [180](#), [181n](#)
- Pietro dalle Carceri, son of (Grappola and) Beatrice (da Verona); triarch of Euboea 1318–1328, double triarch 1328–1340: [450](#); wife of, *see* Balzana Gozzadini
- Pietro de Colona, Venetian apothecary (*fl.* 1366), [296](#)
- Pilat, Humbert, notary (d. 1373), [195n](#), [196n](#)
- Piloti, Emmanuele, Cretan merchant (*fl.* 1430), [262n](#), [356](#), [383n](#), [384n](#), [386](#), [387n](#), [388](#)
- Pindus mountains, [86](#), [89](#)
- Piombino, [338](#)
- Pipino, Francesco, Bolognese Dominican (d. 1314), [133n](#)
- Piraeus, [298](#), [449](#), [450](#)
- Pisa, [13](#), [163](#), [172](#), [193n](#), [279](#), [308n](#), [330](#), [331](#), [339](#); captains of, *see* P. Gambacorta, Jacopo d' Appiano; chapter general of (1263), [56n](#); Council of (1409), [397](#); government of, [139](#), [188](#), [197](#), [204](#); merchants from, [5](#), [12n](#); ships from, [57](#), [339](#)
- Pisanello (Vittore Pisano), Italian artist (d. 1455), [375](#)
- Pisani, Antonio, Venetian castellan (in 1383), [324](#)
- Pisani, Niccolò, Venetian naval commander (in 1346), [206](#), [209](#)
- Pisano d' Amalfi, Angevin jurist (*fl.* 1280), [127n](#)
- Pistoia, [204](#), [205](#), [279](#); chronicler of (*fl.* 1345), [202](#), [204](#)
- Pius II (Eneo Silvio Piccolomini, Aeneas Sylvius), cardinal 1456–1458, pope 1458–1464: [2](#), [256n](#)
- Plantagenets, royal dynasty in England 1154–1485, *see* Richard I 1189–1199, John 1199–1216, Henry III 1216–1272, Edward I 1272–1307, Edward II 1307–1327, Edward III 1327–1377, Richard II 1377–1399, Henry IV 1399–1413; *see also* Edward ("the Black Prince"), John of Gaunt
- Platamona, [45](#), [57](#), [60](#)
- Po, river, [170](#)
- Pofey, Amédée (Amadeo Buffa), constable of Romania (d. 1210), [27](#), [28](#), [35](#), [40n](#), [411n](#)
- Poimaneon, [52](#)
- Poippe, captive (in 1366), [303](#)
- Poitiers, battle of (1356), [231](#), [453](#)
- Pola, [297](#), [307n](#), [346](#), [380](#); count of, [380n](#)
- Poland, [61n](#), [96n](#), [110n](#), [245](#), [249n](#); crusaders from, [346](#); kingdom of, [247n](#), [342](#); kings of, *see* Casimir III 1333–1370, Louis I (of Hungary) 1370–1382, Ladislas (Vladislav) II Jagiello (of Lithuania) 1386–1434, J. Sobieski 1674–1696; *see also* Elizabeth of Poland; people of, [60](#)
- Polenta, ruling family at Ravenna (to 1441), [172](#)
- Polyphengos, [154n](#)
- Ponce de la Roche, lord of La Roche-sur-Ognon (*fl.* 1190), [405](#)
- Pons de Gualba, bishop of Barcelona 1303–1334: [175](#)
- Pont-de-Sorgues, [245n](#)
- Pont S. Esprit, [232](#)
- Popes, *see* Leo IX 1049–1054, Urban II 1088–1099, Alexander III 1159–1181, Innocent III 1198–1216, Honorius III 1216–1227, Gregory IX 1227–1241, Celestine IV in 1241, Innocent IV 1243–1254, Alexander IV 1254–1261, Urban IV 1261–1264, Clement IV 1265–1268, Gregory X 1271–1276, Innocent V in 1276, Hadrian V in 1276, John XXI 1276–1277, Nicholas III 1277–1280, Martin IV 1281–1285, Honorius IV 1285–1287, Nicholas IV 1288–1292, Celestine V in 1294, Boniface VIII 1294–1303, Benedict XI 1303–1304, Clement V 1305–1314, John XXII 1316–1334, Benedict XII 1334–1342, Clement VI 1342–1352, Innocent VI 1352–1362, Urban V 1362–1370, Gregory XI 1370–1378, Urban VI 1378–1389, Boniface IX 1389–1404, Gregory XII 1406–1415, Pius II 1458–1464, Sixtus IV 1471–1484; *see also* Antipopes
- Port-de-Jonc (Old Navarino, Zonklon, Bocca de Zonchio), [297](#), [390](#), [395](#)
- Port de Palli (Port de Paus), [282](#)
- Porthmus, [462](#), [463n](#)
- Porto, cardinal-bishops of, *see* Benedict, Guy de Boulogne; *see also* John XXII
- Porto Longo, [389](#), [395](#)

- Porto Quaglio, [389](#)
 Portofino, [338](#)
 Portovenere, [334](#)
 Portugal, king of, *see* Alfonso III 1248–1278
 Pot, Rénier, agent (*fl.* 1398), [366n](#)
 Poulachas, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1257), [76](#)
 Požegi, [366](#)
 Prague (Praha), archbishop of, *see* Arnestus de Pardubiz
 Prato (in Tuscany), [279](#), and *see* Gerardo da Prato
 Premonstratensians, order, [414n](#)
 Prespa, [85](#)
 Prester John, legendary Christian king, [97n](#)
 Prilep, [43](#), [62](#), [74](#), [75](#), [88](#)
 Propylaea, [468](#), [473](#)
 Prosek, [35](#), [45](#), [62](#); lord of, *see* D. Strez
 Protestants, [1](#)
 Provence, [128](#), [130](#), [152](#), [199n](#), [224](#), [232](#), [238](#), [286](#), [333](#), [434](#); seneschal of, [190](#), [285](#)
 Pteleum (Fetenli), [326](#), [454](#)
 Ptolemy of Lucca, Dominican chronicler (d. after 1312), [113n](#), [128n](#), [138](#), [139n](#)
 Puglia, *see* Apulia
 Pyrgos, [25](#), [38](#)
- Qerqenah islands, [331](#)
 Quercy, [169](#)
 Querini, Venetian counts of Astypalaea (Stampalia) *ca.* 1413–1537: [19n](#), [432](#)
 Querini, Andrea, Venetian bailie in Constantinople 1363–1365: [250](#)
 Querini, Jacopo, litigant (*fl.* 1244), [430](#), [431](#); wife of, *see* Felisa
 Querini, Niccolò, son of Jacopo and Felisa; Venetian bailie at Acre 1278–?1280: [431](#), [432](#)
- Rabban (Mar) Sauma, Nestorian monk (d. 1294), [146](#), [147](#), [148n](#)
 Raccanelli, Pietro, Genoese captain of Smyrna 1363–1371: [247](#), [328](#)
 Radolinski, Peter, bishop of Cracow 1392–1412: [370n](#)
 Radulph de Rivo, dean of Tongres (d. 1403), [470](#)
 Ragusa (Dubrovnik), [228](#), [290](#), [297](#), [300n](#), [307](#), [356](#), [357](#), [359](#), [364](#), [372](#), [379n](#), [381](#), [392](#), [404](#); archbishop of, *see* Hugo de Scuria; merchants of, [60](#); rector of, *see* Marino
 Rahova (Oryakhova), [349](#), [351](#), [354](#)
 Raimbaud de Vaqueiras, French troubador (d. 1207?), [7](#)
 Rainallucci da Corbara, Pietro, Franciscan; antipope ("Nicholas V") 1328–1330: [172](#)
 Rainerio da Siena, Franciscan (*fl.* 1264), [100](#)
 Rainerio da Travaglia, lord of Zeitounion (in 1215), [27n](#), [40](#)
 Ramatas, Manuel, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1257), [76](#)
 Ramón de Perellós, viscount of Roda (*fl.* 1400), [372](#)
 Raoul, John, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1258), [85](#), [88n](#), [89](#)
 Rapondi, Dino (Jodino; "Digne Responde"), Lucchese merchant (*fl.* 1397), [362](#), [365–368](#), [401](#), [402](#)
 Rascia, [290](#)
 Ravano dalle Carceri, triarch of southern Euboea 1205–1209, lord of Euboea 1209–1216: [17n](#), [27n](#), [35](#), [36](#), [40](#), [407n](#), [409–411](#); wife of, *see* Isabella
 Ravenna, [172](#), and *see* Giovanni . . . da Ravenna (2); archbishop of, *see* Rinaldo
 Ravennika, [28](#), [29](#), [34](#), [39](#), [41](#), [63](#); parliament of (1209), [28](#), [29](#), [34](#); concordat of (1210), [39–41](#), [46–48](#), [411–414](#)
- Ray, lords of, [408n](#), [417](#), and *see* Guy de Ray, Othon de la Roche (2); *see also* Gautier and Isabelle de Ray
 Raymond Bérenger, master of the Hospitallers 1356–1374: [264](#), [275](#), [276](#), [278](#), [279](#), [283](#), [327](#)
 Raymond de la Pradèle, archbishop of Nicosia 1361–1376: [243](#), [265](#), [266n](#)
 Raymond de Lescure, Hospitaller prior of Toulouse 1396–1411: [283](#)
 Raynaldus (Odorico Rinaldi), papal annalist (d. 1671), [146](#), [327](#)
 Regensburg, [347](#); bishop of, *see* Albertus Magnus
 Reggio (di) Calabria, [470](#)
 Regno, *see* Naples, kingdom of
 Regola, [314](#)
 Rense, [172](#)
 Resti, Giunio, Ragusan chronicler (d. 1735), [356](#), [372](#)
 Retimo, [254](#)
 Rhaedestus, [321](#); Orthodox (and Latin?) bishop of, *see* John Rhegina (Erkené), river, [73](#)
 Rhegium (Küçükçekmece), [307](#)
 Rheims (Reims), [126n](#), [164n](#), [211](#), [249](#), and *see* Jean de Reims; archbishop of, *see* J. Juvénal des Ursins
 Rhine, river, [347](#); counts palatine of, [173](#)
 Rhineland, [246](#)
 Rhodes, [162n](#), [180](#), [213](#), [233](#), [245](#), [266](#); Latin archbishops of, [186](#), and *see* Emanuel (of Famagusta)
 Rhodes, island of, [3](#), [52](#), [69](#), [166](#), [188](#), [190](#), [191](#), [203](#), [208–210](#), [212](#), [230](#), [236n](#), [237](#), [241](#), [242](#), [245n](#), [255n](#), [258](#), [261](#), [262n](#), [264](#), [266](#), [271](#), [275](#), [277](#), [279](#), [281](#), [282](#), [326](#), [328](#), [337](#), [360–362](#), [364](#), [371](#), [377](#), [382](#), [384–386](#), [388–390](#), [393](#), [394](#), [447](#), [451n](#); lords of, *see* L. Gabalas, J. Palaeologus, and Hospitallers (1306–1523)
 Rhodope mountains, [45](#), [72](#)
 Rhone, river, [121](#), [220](#), [226](#), [232](#), [243](#), [244](#), [434](#)
 Rialto (in Venice), [150n](#), [242](#), [244](#), [260n](#), [276](#)
 Ricci, Genoese merchant firm, [391n](#)
 Ricci, Ardingo, Genoese merchant (*fl.* 1403), [383](#)
 Riccio di S. Donato, Genoese consul (in 1240), [420](#)
 Richard I ("the Lionhearted"), Plantagenet king of England 1189–1199: [4](#)
 Richard II ("of Bordeaux"), son of Edward, the Black Prince; Plantagenet king of England 1377–1399 (d. 1400), [347n](#), [358](#), [374](#)
 Richartinger, Lienhart, Bavarian crusader (d. 1396), [351](#)
 Rieti, [58](#), [148n](#)
 Rigaud, Eudes, archbishop of Rouen 1248–1275: [113](#)
 Rimini, [172](#)
 Rinaldo (Concoreggi), archbishop of Ravenna 1303–1321: [166](#)
 Rinaldo, canon of Santa Sophia (*fl.* 1236), [429](#)
 Riva (Iriva), [371](#)
 Rivoli, [291](#), [292](#), [308n](#)
 Robert ("the Wise"), son of Charles II of Anjou; Angevin king of Naples 1309–1343: [153](#), [154](#), [158](#), [159](#), [170–172](#), [179](#), [181](#), [188](#), [435](#), [448](#), [449n](#), [452](#); wife of, *see* Sancia (of Majorca)
 Robert II, count of Artois 1250–1302, regent of Naples 1284–1289: [433](#)
 Robert, duke of Bar 1352–1411: [359](#), [363](#)
 Robert II, son of Hugh IV; duke of Burgundy and titular king of Thessalonica 1273–1305: [128](#)
 Robert, heir of Guillaume of Champlitte (*fl.* 1209), [34](#)
 Robert de Suciaco, canon of Athens (*fl.* 1209), [408](#)
 Robert of Clari, French chronicler (*fl.* 1216), [9n](#), [18](#)
 Robert of Courtenay, son of Peter and Yolande; Latin emperor of Constantinople 1221–1228: [44](#), [45](#), [51](#), [52](#), [54](#), [63](#), [65](#), [417n](#)

- Robert of Geneva, *see* Clement VII (antipope)
- Robert of S. Severino, count of Corigliano (*fl.* 1345), 197n, 208
- Robert of Taranto, son of Philip I and Catherine; Angevin prince of Albania 1331–1333, of Achaea 1333–1364, titular Latin emperor of Constantinople 1346–1364: 159–161, 188, 194, 199n, 238n, 250, 255, 297; wife of, *see* Marie of Bourbon
- Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont S. Michel (d. 1186), 17n
- Rocaberti, viscount of, *see* F. Dalmau
- Roda, viscount of, *see* Ramón de Perellós
- Rodez, 275
- Roger II, count of Sicily 1101–1130, king 1130–1154: 331
- Roger, Latin archbishop of Patras 1337–1347: 186, 206
- Roger, Guillaume (II), brother of Clement VI; viscount of Beaufort (*fl.* 1344), 196n
- Roger, Guillaume (III), of Beaufort, son of G. Roger (II); viscount of Turenne 1350–1395: 263, 265, 271, 273; wife of (Eleanor), 263
- Roger, Hugues, brother of Clement VI; cardinal 1342–1363: 220
- Roger, Pierre, *see* Clement VI and Gregory XI
- Roger de Flor, leader of Catalans (d. 1305), 164n, 169, 441
- Roger de Lluria, (Italian) admiral (d. 1305), 148n, 156n, 157
- Roger de Lluria, (Catalan) ruler of Thebes and vicar-general of Athens (1362) 1366–*ca.* 1370: 307, 456–459
- Roger des Pins, master of the Hospitallers 1355–1365: 227, 231, 234n, 235, 239, 247, 250, 258n
- Roger le Fort, archbishop of Bourges 1343–1368: 245
- Roland de Vaisy, French crusader (d. 1366), 293, 299
- Romagna, 86n, 166, 169, 172, 231; rector of, 210n
- Roman Catholic (Latin) Church, 1, 4, 10, 13–16, 20, 37–42, 47, 48, 58, 66, 70n, 79, 96, 97, 102–104, 106–108, 112, 114, 116–120, 124, 125, 128, 149, 152, 157, 160, 163–166, 168, 173–175, 186, 193, 196, 198, 199, 203, 205, 213, 215, 217, 222, 224–229, 231, 234, 235, 236n, 238, 243, 246, 247, 250, 255, 259, 276, 286, 288, 289, 290n, 308, 313–315, 323, 337, 344, 367, 370, 406, 408n, 409–417, 419, 425, 429, 437, 443, 446, 447, 455, 460, 461, 465, 467–469, 471
- Romania, *see* Byzantine empire, Latin empire of Constantinople
- Romans, kings of the, 171, 173, and *see* Germany, kings of
- Romanus, bishop of Croia (in 1294), 150
- Rome (Roma), 4, 7, 37n, 38, 44, 45n, 64, 108, 110, 121, 123, 125, 128, 131–134, 138, 146, 147, 148n, 151, 152, 170–173, 176, 177, 187, 207, 277, 279, 280, 283, 306, 308, 309, 312–315, 316n, 319, 320, 327, 333, 340–342, 370, 372, 379n, 409, 412, 416, 418, 436, 446, 461, 464n, 469, 470, and *see* Bartholomew of Rome; bishops of, *see* Popes; *see also* Roman Catholic Church
- Roncesvalles, battle of (778), 355
- Roosebeke, battle of (1382), 332
- Rosetta (Rashīd), 282
- Rosso, Niccolò Morosini, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1278–1280: 427
- Rostislav Mikhailovich, son of Michael (Mikhail) Vsevolodovich; prince (d. *ca.* 1262), 73; wife of, *see* Anna (of Hungary)
- Rouen, archbishops of, 179, and *see* E. Rigaud
- Rovigno, 307
- Rovine, battle of (1395), 341
- Roye, Pierre, French sculptor (*fl.* 1353), 223
- Rudolph II, duke of Saxony 1356–1370: 247
- Rudolph I, Hapsburg king of Germany and claimant to empire 1273–1291: 114, 123, 128, 133
- Rudolph IV, nephew of Frederick III; Hapsburg duke of Austria 1358–1365: 247
- Rudolph of Città di Castello, Augustinian theologian (*fl.* 1366), 288
- Rumelia, 376
- Ruphi, Antoine, Niçois captain (*fl.* 1346), 208
- Russia, 61, 97, 108n, 320, 352n; princes of, 73
- Rychaldus, interpreter (*fl.* 1274), 116n
- Sabina, 231; cardinal-bishops of, *see* P. Gomez de Barroso, Bertrand de Déaux, Gil de Albornoz, Bessarion, Amadeo (VIII of Savoy), Isidore; *see also* Celestine IV, Clement IV
- Sachlikina, widow of R. Logaras (*fl.* 1213), 29, 30, 51
- Safad, 108
- Saint Albans, monks of, 274n, 276, 376n
- Saint André, 175
- Saint Catherine, monastery (below Mt. Sinai), 283
- Saint David's, 409; bishop of, *see* Giraldus Cambrensis
- Saint Denis, abbey (near Paris), 38, 39, 147, 249, 347; chronicle of, 333, 334, 335n, 336, 341, 345n, 348–355, 370n, 372, 375, 376
- Saint Denis, lord of, *see* Étienne de la Baume
- Saint Flour, bishop of (Pierre d'Estaing 1361–1368), 245
- Saint George, castle, 154, 437
- Saint George, head of, 372, 456
- Saint Jean d'Acre, *see* Acre
- Saint Jean de Maurienne, 292; bishop of (Amadeo of Savoy 1349–1376), 286n
- Saint Mark (San Marco), church (at Venice), 8, 34, 79, 256, 296; republic of, *see* Venice, republic of
- Saint Nicholas, church (at Patras), 452
- Saint Omer (in Flanders), 418; family of, 418n, and *see* Bela, Nicholas (3), and Othon of S. Omer
- Saint Omer, castle (at Thebes), 156, 157n, 452
- Saint Peter's, church (in Rome), 108, 133, 134n, 138n, 147, 170, 172, 176, 177, 313, 341
- Saint Pol, counts of, *see* Hugh IV, Guy III
- Saint Pons de Thomières, bishop of, *see* É. Cambarou
- Saladin, Aiyūbid sultan of Egypt (1169) and Syria 1174–1193: 4
- Salamis, 18, 181, 191, 454
- Salamon, Nicholas, Latin archbishop of Athens 1328–1351: 186, 429n, 461–463
- Salamon, Philip, brother of Nicholas (*fl.* 1353), 461n
- Salerno, prince of, *see* Charles II of Anjou
- Salimbene of Parma, Franciscan chronicler (*fl.* 1280), 139
- Salona (Amphissa, La Sola), 29, 35, 43, 86, 90, 378, 409, 410n, 416, 439, 442, 444, 451, 454, 471; Articles of, 467n; Gulf of (or of Crissa), 90; Latin bishops of, 462, and *see* Philip, Albert; lords of, *see* Thomas d'Autremencourt (3), R. Deslaur, and Alfonso, Pedro I, James, and Luis Fadrique
- Saluzzo, marquis of, 329
- Salzburg, archbishopric of, 248, 258, 343
- Samarkand, 376
- Samos, 3, 18, 52, 104, 428n
- Samothrace, 18
- San Germano, 59
- San Giorgio d'Arbora (Belbina), 298
- San Niccolò (Aulaimon), 451
- San Superano, *see* Pedro ("Bordo") de San Superano
- Sancia, sister of Ferdinand of Majorca; wife of Robert of Naples 1309–1343 (d. 1345), 188
- Sangarius (Sakarya), river, 18
- Sangiorgio, Benvenuto, count of Biandrate (d. 1527), 53n
- Sant' Angelo, Cape, 384, 389, 394, 395
- Santa Maura, *see* Leukas
- Santa Sophia, *see* Hagia Sophia
- Santorin, *see* Thera

- Sanudi, Venetian ducal dynasty at Naxos 1207–1371 (1383), 19n, *and see* Marco I *ca.* 1207–*ca.* 1227, Angelo *ca.* 1227–1262, Marco II 1262–1303, Niccolò I 1323–1341, Giovanni I 1341–1362, *and* Fiorenza 1362–1371
- Sanudo, Angelo, son of Marco I; duke of Naxos *ca.* 1227–1262: 57n, 63n, [68](#), [83](#), [91](#), [430](#), [431](#); wife of, [95](#)
- Sanudo, Filippo, son of Leone; Negropontine commander (in 1271), [424](#)
- Sanudo, Fiorenza, daughter of Giovanni I; wife of Giovanni dalle Carceri 1349–1358, duchess of Naxos 1362–1371: 247n
- Sanudo, Giovanni I (“Janulli”), brother of Niccolò I; duke of Naxos 1341–1362: [188](#), [221](#), [222](#), 247n
- Sanudo, Leone, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1252–1254: [424](#)
- Sanudo, Marco I, nephew of Enrico Dandolo; duke of Naxos *ca.* 1207–*ca.* 1227: 17n, 19n, [426](#), [428](#), [431](#)
- Sanudo, Marco II, son of Angelo; duke of Naxos 1262–1303: [69](#), [95](#), [144](#), [431](#), [432](#)
- Sanudo, Marino (“Torsello”), Venetian chronicler and publicist (d. 1337), [56](#), [69](#), [77–80](#), 88n, [99](#), [109](#), [136–138](#), 168n, [174](#), [180](#), 182n, [422](#), [424–428](#), [431](#), [432](#), 442n, 451n, 453n
- Sanudo, Marino (“the Younger”), Venetian historian (d. 1533), [255](#)
- Sanudo, Niccolò I, grandson of Marco II; duke of Naxos 1323–1341: [69](#), [156](#), [157](#), 188n
- Sanudo, Tommaso, Venetian envoy (in 1369), [314](#)
- Sapienza, [34](#), [371](#), [384](#), [389](#), 390n, [394](#), [395](#)
- Saquet, Raymond, bishop of Thérouanne 1334–1356: [193](#), 206n, [221](#), [222](#), 229n, [236](#), [455](#)
- Saracens, *see* Moslems
- Saragossa (Zaragoza), 464n; archbishop of, *see* G. Fernández de Heredia
- Sarandaporos, river, [87](#)
- Sardica (Sofia), Council of ([343](#)), [71](#)
- Sardinia, [142](#), [152](#), [163](#), [169](#), [332–334](#), [338](#), [443](#), [446](#), [455](#), 464n; merchants from, [337](#)
- Sardo, Ranieri, Pisan merchant (d. by 1399), 338n
- Sarepta (Šarafand), [280](#)
- Saronic Gulf, [298](#), [419](#), [449](#)
- Sarukhan, [341](#), [376](#)
- Saulger, Robert, chronicler (d. 1709), 57n
- Savelli, Cencio and Jacopo, *see* Honorius III *and* IV
- Savona, [396](#)
- Savoy, [285](#), [286](#), [302](#), [304](#), [397](#); counts of, *see* Amadeo V 1285–1323, Amadeo VI 1343–1383, Amadeo VII 1383–1391, Amadeo VIII 1391–1416, duke 1416–1440; *see also* Amadeo, Anna (Jeanne), Blanche, Louis, *and* Philip of Savoy
- Saxony-Wittenberg, dukes of, [173](#), *and see* Rudolph II 1356–1370
- Scagnier, Donato, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), 294n
- Scaligeri, ruling family at Verona 1260–1389: [172](#), [188](#), [197](#), [243](#), *and see* Alberto *and* Mastino della Scala
- Scardona, [228](#)
- Scarlatto, Giovanni, Latin bishop of Coron 1346–1348: [203](#)
- Schiltberger, Johann, Bavarian crusader (in 1396), [351–356](#)
- Schism, [71](#), [110](#), [111](#), [164](#), [165](#), [168](#), [224](#), [225](#), [287](#), [288](#), [311](#), [313](#), [314](#); Cerularian (1054), [1](#), [132](#); Great (1378–1417), 173n, [187](#), [333](#), [342](#), [370](#), [463](#)
- Sclavonia, [209](#); ban of, 73n
- Scordilli, George, Greek noble (*fl.* 1363), 250n
- Scotland, 110n; people of, 374n
- Scuola of S. Giovanni Evangelista, [284](#)
- Scutari (in Albania), [404](#)
- Scutari (on the Bosphorus), [312](#)
- “Scythians,” [160](#), *and see* Cumans
- Sea Gate (Bāb al-Baḥr, at Alexandria), [269](#), [270](#)
- Sebenico (Šibenik), [228](#), [404](#)
- Second Bulgarian Empire, [3](#)
- Second Crusade (1147–1149), [2](#)
- Segna (Senj), [290](#), [347](#), [404](#)
- Segni, *see* John de’Conti of Segni; *see also* Innocent III (Lotario), Gregory IX (Ugolino), *and* Alexander IV (Rinaldo de’ Conti)
- Seine, river, [20](#), [375](#)
- Selim II, great-grandson of Bayazid II; Ottoman sultan 1566–1574: 19n
- Seljuks (Selchūkids), Turkish dynasty in Anatolia (“Rûm”) [1071–1302](#): [61](#), [146](#), *and see* Kai-Khusrau II 1237–1245, Kai-Ka’us II 1245–1261
- Selymbria (Silivri), [92](#), [213](#), [311](#), [321](#), [322](#)
- Seminara, [189](#)
- Senlis, bishop of, *see* Guy de Plailly
- Sens, archbishop of, *see* Pierre de Charny
- Serai, 108n
- Serbia, [52](#), 73n, [183](#), [226](#), [300](#), [329](#), [341](#), [342](#), [348](#), [359](#); kingdom of, [104](#), [259](#), [460](#); kings of, *see* Nemanyids 1168–1371; mercenaries from, [85](#)
- Serbs, [3](#), [43](#), [61](#), [73–75](#), [109](#), 246n, 317n, [320](#), [328](#), [329](#), [343](#), [367](#), [379](#), [451](#); rulers of, *see* Lazar I 1371–1389, Stephen Lazarević 1389–1427
- Seriphos, [428](#), [462](#)
- Serquices, [439](#)
- Serres (Serrai), [28](#), [45](#), [52](#), [62](#), [69](#), [83](#), 246n, 317n, [329](#)
- Servia, [45](#), [57](#), [73](#), [74](#), [87](#)
- Servion, Jean, 15th-century chronicler, 292n
- Sette Pozzi (Spetsai), battle of (1263), 96n, [100](#)
- “Seventh Crusade” (1249–1250), [2](#), [69](#)
- Sfax (Safāqus), [331](#)
- Sgourus, Leo, lord of Corinth (d. 1208), [21–23](#), 24n, [25](#), [34](#), [405](#), [406](#); wife of, *see* Eudocia (Angelina)
- Sha’bān, al-Ashraf Nāṣir-ad-Dīn, grandson of an-Nāṣir; Bahrī Mamluk sultan of Egypt and Syria 1363–1376: [262](#), [266](#), [271](#), [272](#), [274–283](#), 291n
- Shipka pass, [350](#)
- Sibylle de la Roche, sister of Othon; wife of Jacques de Cicon (*fl.* 1220), [417](#), [418](#)
- Sicard, bishop of Cremona 1185–1215: 17n
- Sicilian Vespers (1282), [105](#), [140–144](#), [428](#), [432](#), [441](#)
- Sicily (“Trinacria”), [1](#), [7](#), 33n, [107](#), [109](#), [117](#), [130](#), [138](#), 139n, [140–145](#), [147–149](#), [152](#), [165](#), [169](#), [179](#), [226](#), [227](#), [237](#), [248](#), [258](#), [327](#), [330](#), [335](#), [338](#), [388](#), [392](#), [427](#), [433](#), [446](#), [454](#), [455](#), 458n; kingdom of, [3](#), [82](#), [85](#), [86](#), [113](#), [128](#), [131](#), [138](#), [139](#), [142](#), [143](#), 149n, [166](#), [170](#), [206](#), [294](#), [331](#), [340](#), [342](#), [437](#), [443–445](#), [449](#), [456](#), [460](#), [466](#), [467](#), *and see* Constance; kings of, *see* Roger II (count 1101–1130) 1130–1154, William II 1166–1189, Henry (VI) 1194–1197, Frederick I (II) 1197–1212 (1250), Conradin 1254–1258, Manfred 1258–1266, Charles I of Anjou (1266) 1268–1282, Peter I (Pedro III of Aragon-Catalonia) 1282–1285, James I (II) 1285–1296, Frederick II 1296–1337, Peter II 1337–1342, Frederick III 1355–1377, Martin I 1391–1409, Martin II (I) 1409–1410; queen of, *see* Maria 1377–1402; ships from, 94n
- Siderocastron (Sideroporta), [87](#), [424](#), [432](#), [442–444](#), [451](#), [459](#)
- Sidon (Sagitta, Šaidā), [279](#), [282](#), [387](#)
- Siebenbürgen, voivode of, *see* Stephen Lacković; *see also* Transylvania
- Siena, 27n, [188](#), [193](#), [197](#), [204](#), [279](#), 308n, *and see* Bartolommeo *and* Rainerio da Siena
- Sigeros, Nicholas, Byzantine envoy (in 1347), [213](#), [215](#), [226](#)
- Sigismund (of Luxemburg), son of Charles IV; king of Hungary 1385 (1387)–1437, of Germany 1410 (1414)–1433, of Bohemia 1419 (1436)–1437, emperor 1433–

- 1437: [341–351](#), [353–359](#), 360n, [366–368](#), 381n, [400](#), [401](#), [403](#), 472n
- Simeon, tsar of Bulgaria 893–927: [53](#), [55](#)
- Simon, Latin patriarch of Constantinople 1227?–1232: [58](#), [429](#)
- Simon, titular Latin bishop of Laodicea (in 1366), [273](#)
- Simon Atumano, bishop of Gerace 1348–1366, archbishop of Thebes 1366–*ca.* 1386: [259](#), [466](#), [468–471](#)
- Simona, niece of William of Villehardouin; wife of Guglielmo I da Verona (*fl.* 1255), [78](#)
- Simona of Aragon, daughter of Alfonso Fadrique; wife of Giorgio II Ghisi (from 1327), 156n
- Sinai, Mount (Jabal Mūsā), [283](#)
- Sion (Sitten), bishop of (Guichard Tavelli 1342–1375), 286n
- Siphnos, [428](#)
- Sirello di Pietro (of Ancona), Latin archbishop of Thebes 1351–*ca.* 1357: [455](#), [457](#)
- Šišman, John, son of John Alexander; Šišmanid tsar of eastern Bulgaria *ca.* 1360–1393: [290](#), [300–304](#), 329n
- Šišmanids (Shishmanids), tsars of Bulgaria 1323–1396, *see* John Alexander 1331–1371, John Šišman *ca.* 1360–1393 (eastern), John Sracimir *ca.* 1360–1396 (western)
- Sisopolis, *see* Sozopolis
- Sivino da Caristo, Italian at Negroponte (by 1262), 81n
- “Sixth Crusade” (1228–1229), [55](#)
- Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere), cardinal 1467–1471, pope 1471–1484: [118](#)
- Skiathos, [377](#); lord of, *see* Geremia Ghisi
- Skopelos, [377](#), [426](#); lords of, *see* Geremia and Filippo Ghisi
- Skoplje, [62](#)
- Skortá, [31](#), [437](#)
- Skyros, [377](#), [408](#), [409](#), 410n, [426](#), [462](#); lord of, *see* Geremia Ghisi
- Slavs, [3](#), [25](#), [26](#), [61](#), [63](#), [68](#), 254n, 290n, [342](#), 357n; *see also* Bulgarians, Melings, Serbs
- Smithfield, [246](#)
- Smyrna (Izmir), [33](#), [72](#), [91](#), [160](#), [181](#), 190n, [191–195](#), 197–199, 201–205, 207, 208, 212–223, 227, 229–231, 233–240, 243, 247, 285, 286, 328, 341, 455; captains of, *see* Barnaba da Parma, O. Dolfín, N. Benedetti, P. Raccanelli, O. Cattaneo; Latin archbishops of, [328](#), and *see* Paulus, Francis(?), Thomas de Savigny
- Smyrniote crusades (1343–1351), [184–215](#), 218, 220–223, [456](#)
- Sobieski, John, king of Poland 1674–1696: [1](#)
- Sofia (Sardica), [329](#)
- Soissons, [7](#), and *see* Margaret of Soissons; countess of, *see* Isabelle of Lorraine
- Soranzo, Giovanni, doge of Venice 1312–1328: 154n, [177](#), [448–452](#)
- Soranzo, Marco, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1345–1347: [202](#), [454](#)
- Soranzo, Pietro, Venetian envoy to Cairo (in 1366), [274](#)
- Soriano, [134](#)
- Sosandri, monastery, [76](#)
- Soscutus, [86](#), [88](#)
- Soverani, Marino, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1366), 294n, 295n
- Sozopolis (Sisopolis), [302](#), [304–306](#), [308–310](#), [391](#); Latin bishops of, *see* Ambrosius, G. Conti
- Spain, [1](#), 110n, [144](#), [169](#), [194](#), 316n, [342](#), [370](#); crusaders from, 166n; kings of, [2](#), and *see* Philip II 1556–1598; soldiers from, [427](#)
- Spalato (Split), [228](#), [357](#), [367](#), [404](#); archbishop of, *see* Ugolino de Malabranca
- Spanopoulus, George, Byzantine official (in 1347), [213](#), [215](#)
- Sparta, bishop of, *see* Lacedaemonia
- Spezia, Gulf of, [334](#)
- Sphenaritzia, [81](#), [136](#)
- Sphrantzes, George, 15th-century Byzantine official and historian, 316n
- Spiafamias, Bartolommeo, Lucchese merchant (*fl.* 1350), [221](#)
- Spinelli, Matteo (da Giovinnazzo), Italian chronicler (*fl.* 1260), 86n, [90](#)
- Spinola, Ansaldo, Genoese envoy (in 1397), [363](#)
- Spiritual Franciscans (Fratricelli or “Bisoci”), [151](#), [173](#), [224](#)
- Spoletto, [150](#), [169](#); duchy of, [231](#)
- Sponza, palace (at Ragusa), [356](#)
- Sracimir (Stracimir, Sračimir), John, son of John Alexander; Šišmanid tsar of western Bulgaria *ca.* 1360–1396: [287](#), [348](#), 349n
- Stampalia, *see* Astypalaea
- Stavros, [419](#)
- Stella, Giorgio, Genoese chronicler (*fl.* 1420), [197](#), [379](#), [394](#), [398](#)
- Stenimachus, [62](#)
- Steno, Michele, doge of Venice 1400–1413: [326](#), [390](#), [391](#), [394–396](#), [400](#), [402–404](#)
- Stephen, *see also* Étienne
- Stephen V, son of Bela IV; Árpád king of Hungary 1270–1272: [111](#)
- Stephen, brother of Louis I of Hungary; claimant to Naples (in 1345), 199n
- Stephen, Latin archbishop of Athens (*ca.* 1300), [151](#)
- Stephen, Latin archbishop of Corfu (in 1296), [150](#), 151n
- Stephen, Latin archbishop of Thebes 1312–*d.* by 1326: [447](#)
- Stephen (de Pinu), titular Latin patriarch of Constantinople in 1346: [462](#)
- Stephen de Insula, bishop of Neutria 1350–1367: [288](#)
- Stephen de Kanizza, brother of John; Hungarian magnate (*fl.* 1396), [357](#)
- Stephen Dragutin, son of Stephen Urosh I; Nemanyid king of Serbia 1276–1282: [130](#)
- Stephen Lacković, voivode of Siebenbürgen (Transylvania) in 1396: [355](#)
- Stephen Lazarević, son of Lazar I; ruler of the Serbs 1389–1427: [350](#), [355](#)
- Stephen Urosh (Uroš) I, Nemanyid king of Serbia 1242–1276: [74](#), [75](#), [85](#), [106](#)
- Stephen Urosh II Milutin, son of Stephen Urosh I; Nemanyid king of Serbia 1282–1321: 166n
- Stephen Urosh IV Dushan (Dušan), grandson of Stephen Urosh II Milutin; Nemanyid king of Serbia 1331–1345, “emperor” 1345–1355: [3](#), [213–215](#), [225](#), [226](#), [451](#)
- Stephen Urosh V, son of Stephen Urosh IV Dushan; Nemanyid king of Serbia 1355–1371: [290](#)
- Stip, [62](#)
- Stiris, [444](#); abbey (of S. Luke) at, [438](#), [444](#); abbot of, [414](#); lord of, *see* W. Fadrique
- Straits, *see* Bosphorus, Dardanelles
- Strambaldi, Diomedes, Cypriote chronicler (*ca.* 1540), [382](#)
- Strategopoulus, Alexius, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1261), 62n, [85](#), 88n, [89](#), [90](#), [92–94](#)
- Straubing, [347](#)
- Strez, Dobromir, nephew of Ioannitsa; Asenid lord of Prosek (*d. ca.* 1213), [35](#)
- Stromer, Ulman, Nuremberg chronicler (*d.* 1407), [351](#)
- Strymbakon, Orthodox bishop of Cassandrea (in 1213), [30](#)
- Strymon, river, [45](#), [62](#)
- Suboto, [130](#)
- Suffolk, earl of (Robert de Ufford), [253](#), [254](#)
- Suleiman, son of Bayazid I; governor of European Turkey, contender for sultanate 1402–1411: 306n, 329n, 376–380

- Sully, *see* Hugh le Rousseau de Sully; lord of, *see* Guy de la Trémoille
- Suriano, Jacopo, Venetian envoy (in 1403), [380](#)
- Susa (in Italy), [291](#), [308n](#)
- Susa (Sūsah, in Tunisia), [331](#), [334](#)
- Swabia, duke of, *see* Philip of Swabia
- Switzerland, [366](#)
- Sybert of Beek, 14th-century Carmelite polemicist, [171](#)
- Synadenus, John, Byzantine general (*fl.* 1278), [426](#)
- Syria, [2](#), [24](#), [106](#), [108](#), [109](#), [121](#), [129](#), [174](#), [241](#), [266](#), [275](#), [276](#), [278](#), [281–284](#), [286](#), [287](#), [292](#), [329n](#), [330](#), [339n](#), [345](#), [348n](#), [382](#), [384n](#), [385n](#), [387](#), [388](#), [393](#), [394](#); rulers of, [97](#), *and see* Aiyūbids, Mamluks; waters off, [291](#), [294](#)
- Syros, [462](#)
- Taberner, A., Aragonese envoy (in 1278), [139n](#)
- Tacconi, Isnard, Dominican; Latin archbishop of Thebes 1308–1311, 1326–1342, bishop of Pavia and titular patriarch of Antioch 1311–1319: [453](#), [455](#)
- Taddeo de' Pepoli, lord of Bologna 1337–1347: [199](#), [204](#), [210n](#)
- Taddeo di Firenze, Angevin jurist (*fl.* 1280), [127n](#)
- Tagliacozzo, battle of (1268), [105](#)
- Talleyrand, Élias (of Périgord), cardinal 1331–1364: [226](#), [244](#), [245](#), [258](#), [294](#)
- Tana (Azov), [320](#), [329](#), [358n](#), [389](#)
- Taranto (Tarentum), princes of, *see* Manfred, *and* Louis, Philip [2](#), *and* Robert of Taranto
- Tarascon, [434](#)
- Tarchaneiotēs, Andronicus, nephew of Michael VIII Palaeologus (*fl.* 1267), [422](#), [423n](#)
- Tarchaneiotēs, Macarius Glabas, uncle of John V Palaeologus; Byzantine monk (*fl.* 1367), [311](#)
- Tarentaise, 123n, *and see* Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise); archbishop of, *see* Jean de Bertrand
- Taronas, Vlach chieftain (*fl.* 1259), [87](#)
- Tatars, *see* Mongols
- Taygetus, Mount, [25](#), [63](#), [68](#)
- Tekke, [376](#); emir of, [240](#)
- Temesvar, count of, [352n](#)
- Tempe, [45](#), [57](#)
- Tempier, Étienne, bishop of Paris 1268–1279: [113](#)
- Templars, or Knights Templars, military order, [13](#), [28n](#), [38](#), [66n](#), [165](#), [168n](#), [169](#), [170](#), [186](#), [230](#), [447](#); grand master of, *see* Jacques de Molay 1298–1307; master of, *see* William of Beaujeu 1273–1291
- Tenedos (Bozcaada), [3](#), [239n](#), [307](#), [317–326](#), [329](#), [392](#), [455](#); Venetian captains of, *see* Z. Mudazzo, G. Memo
- Tenos, [326](#); lords of, *see* Ghisi
- Terra di Lavoro, [150](#)
- Terracina, [338](#)
- Teutonic Knights, military order, [38](#), [346n](#)
- Thalassinon, [439](#)
- Thamar ("Catherine"), daughter of Nicephorus I Ducas and Anna; wife of Philip I of Taranto 1294–1309 (d. 1311), [435](#), [436](#)
- Thebes (Thebai, Estives), 19n, [20n](#), [22](#), [23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [33n](#), [42](#), [49](#), [65–67](#), [78](#), [80](#), [86](#), [89](#), [95](#), [129n](#), [156](#), [157](#), [206](#), [233](#), [258](#), [298](#), [328](#), [329](#), [405](#), [406](#), [408](#), [411–418](#), [420](#), [421](#), [423–425](#), [432](#), [433](#), [437](#), [440–447](#), [452](#), [456](#), [458–462](#), [466–473](#); Articles of, [459](#); dean of, *see* M. Oller; lady of, *see* Bonne de la Roche; Latin archbishops of, [29](#), [37](#), [46](#), [47](#), [50n](#), [64](#), [66](#), [96](#), [149](#), [411–414](#), [420](#), *and see* I. Tacconi, Stephen, Philip, Sirello di Pietro, Paulus, Simon Atumano; lords of, *see* Albertino da Canossa, Guy I de la Roche, Bela, Nicholas II, Othon, *and* Nicholas III of S. Omer, Giorgio II Ghisi, Roger de Lloria, Antonio I Acciajuoli; Orthodox metropolitan of, [24n](#), [29n](#); veguer of, *see* Nicholas de Ardoino
- Theobald I, count of Bar 1191–1214: [7](#)
- Theobald III, count of Champagne 1197–1201: [7](#)
- Theodora, daughter of Theodore II Lascaris (*fl.* 1258), [76](#)
- Theodora, of Mesembria (*fl.* 1366), [304](#)
- Theodora Petraliphas (Petraliphina), wife of Michael II Ducas (m. by 1230, d. after 1271, canonized), [59](#), [60](#), [73](#), [85](#)
- Theodore, Byzantine official (in 1275), [121](#), [123](#), [125](#)
- Theodore, Orthodox (and Catholic) bishop of Negroponte (in 1208), [410](#), [411](#)
- Theodore Ducas, half-brother of Michael I; ruler of Epirus 1215–1230, "emperor" of Thessalonica 1225–1230 (d. 1254), [29](#), [36](#), [41n](#), [43–45](#), [50–61](#), [69](#), [70](#), [72](#), [76](#), [81](#), [406](#), [416](#), [417](#)
- Theodore I Lascaris, brother of Constantine; Byzantine emperor (1205) at Nicaea 1208–1222: [13n](#), [43](#), [44n](#), [52](#), [406](#)
- Theodore II Lascaris, son of John III Vatatzes; Byzantine emperor at Nicaea 1254–1258: [57n](#), [71n](#), [72–77](#), [81](#), [84](#), [85](#), [92](#); wife of, *see* Helena (Asenina)
- Theodore II Palaeologus, son of Giovanni II; marquis of Montferrat 1381–1418: [398](#), [399](#)
- Theophanes, Orthodox metropolitan at Nicaea (in 1274), [114](#), [115](#), [135](#)
- Thera (Santorin), [19n](#)
- Thermia (Cythnus), [462](#)
- Thermopylae, [22](#), [28](#), [45](#), [50](#), [79](#), [387](#), [416](#), [417n](#); Latin bishopric of, [408](#), [409](#), [429](#); bishops of, [409n](#) (Arnulf 1208–1212), [462](#), [466](#)
- Théroutanne, bishop of, *see* R. Saquet
- Thessalonica (Salonika), [3](#), [16](#), [17](#), [21](#), [24n](#), [28](#), [30](#), [42–45](#), [50](#), [51](#), [53](#), [55](#), [56](#), [58–63](#), [67](#), [73–75](#), [77](#), [83](#), [85](#), [110](#), [144](#), [183](#), [301](#), [315](#), [317](#), [320](#), [321](#), [329](#), [341](#), [377](#), [416](#), [417](#), [440](#); dean of, [47](#); governors of, [30](#), [69](#), [74](#); Gulf of, [45](#); Latin archbishop of, *see* Garinus; Orthodox metropolitans of, [30](#), *and see* C. Mesopotamites
- Thessalonica, "despotate" of, [58](#), [61](#), [63](#), [64](#), [67](#); despots of, *see* Ducae; lordship and kingdom of, [17–19](#), [21](#), [25n](#), [27](#), [29](#), [35](#), [39](#), [40](#), [50–53](#), [56](#), [83](#), [105](#), [411](#), [415](#), [416](#), [418n](#); lords and (from 1209) kings of, *see* Boniface I (of Montferrat) 1204–1207, Demetrius 1207–1224; titular kings of, *see* Boniface II 1230–1253, Hugh (IV of Burgundy) 1266–1273, Robert (II of Burgundy) 1273–1305, Louis of Burgundy 1313–1316
- Thessaly (Vlachia), [22n](#), [29](#), [35](#), [39](#), [42](#), [43](#), [45](#), [51](#), [53](#), [59](#), [60](#), [73](#), [81–83](#), [85–87](#), [89](#), [129](#), [143](#), [329](#), [422–425](#), [435](#), [438–442](#), [451](#)
- Third Crusade (1189–1192), [2](#), [4](#)
- Thomas, Franciscan; Latin archbishop of Paros and Naxos (from 1357), [457](#)
- Thomas I d'Autremencourt, lord of Salona 1205–*ca.* 1211: [35](#)
- Thomas II d'Autremencourt, son of Thomas I; lord of Salona *ca.* 1211–d. after 1258: [40](#), [79](#), [416](#), [420n](#), [421](#)
- Thomas III d'Autremencourt, grandson of Thomas II; lord of Salona 1294–1311: [151](#), [435](#), [438–440](#); wife of, [451](#)
- Thomas de Kapolya, archbishop of Kalocsa 1358–1367: [289](#)
- Thomas de Savigny, Latin archbishop of Smyrna 1362–1373: [247](#)
- Thomas de Ufford, English noble (*fl.* 1366), [253](#)
- Thomas Ducas, son of Nicephorus I and Anna; despot of Epirus 1296–1318: [438](#)
- Thomas of Verona ("Tommasaccio"), son of Boniface; lord of Larmena (d. 1326), [450](#)

- Thrace, [11](#), [16](#), [18](#), [27](#), [52](#), [55–57](#), [62](#), [72](#), [73](#), [75](#), [92](#), 93n, 164n, 166n, 193n, [213](#), [215](#), [225](#), [226](#), 245n, 246n, [441](#)
- Tiber (Tevere), river, 315n, [341](#)
- Tiepolo, Jacopo, Venetian podestà in Constantinople (in 1219), doge of Venice 1229–1249: 44n, 52n, [430](#)
- Tiepolo, Lorenzo, doge of Venice 1268–1275: [111](#)
- Timur (Lenk, “the Lame”; Tamerlane), Timurid Gur-khan 1369–1405: [223](#), 358n, [376](#), [377](#), [379](#)
- Timurtash (Pasha), Ottoman general (*fl.* 1397), 472n
- Tirnovó, [20](#), [55](#), [56](#), [91](#), [303](#), 305n, [329](#), [350](#)
- Tlemcen (Tilimsān), [330](#)
- Tongres, dean of, *see* Radulph de Rivo
- Tonnerre, county of, [44](#)
- Tornikes, Constantine, Byzantine logothete (*fl.* 1201), 21n
- Tornikes, Demetrius, brother of George; Byzantine logothete (*fl.* 1193), [4n](#)
- Tornikes, George, Orthodox metropolitan of Ephesus (in 1156), [4n](#), 22n
- Torresella (“Torexela”), Venetian prison in the doge’s palace, [391](#), [393](#)
- Torriani, Lodovico, Latin bishop of Coron 1357–1359, patriarch of Aquileia 1359–1365: 233n
- Tortosa (Tartūs), [279](#), [282](#)
- Toti, Francesco, 14th-century Franciscan polemicist, [171](#)
- Toucy, *see* Anseau and Narjot of Toucy
- Toulon, 265n
- Toulouse, [331](#); archbishop of, *see* Geoffroy de Veyrols; Hospitaller prior of, *see* Raymond de Lescure
- Touraine, duke of, *see* Louis (I) 1386–1391
- Tours, coinage of, [49](#), [150](#), [165](#)
- Tower of Galata, [10](#), 11n
- Trachinian plain (Thalassinum), [87](#)
- Traianopolis, 17n, [19](#)
- Trani, [82](#), [86](#), 109n
- Transylvania (Siebenbürgen), [61](#), [355](#)
- Trapani, [140](#), 335n, [338](#)
- Trau (Trogir), [228](#), [404](#)
- Trebizond (Trabzon), [18](#), [52](#), [320](#), [329](#), 358n; emperors of, *see* Comneni, Grand
- Treverneis, Savoyard crusader (in 1366), [304](#)
- Trevisan, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Trevisan, Jacopo, Venetian envoy (in [1411](#)), [326](#)
- Trevisan, Zaccaria, Venetian envoy (in 1402), 379n
- Treviso, 200n, 260n, [281](#), [307](#), [322](#), [343](#), [361](#), [365](#), [366](#), 400, [401](#), [403](#); podestà of, [242](#)
- Tricoryphus, [90](#)
- Trier, archbishops of, [173](#)
- Trikkala, [438](#), [439](#)
- Trinacria, *see* Sicily
- Triphylia, 162n
- Tripoli (in Africa), [280](#), [331](#)
- Tripoli (in Syria; Tarābulus), [108](#), 277n, [278](#), [279](#), [387](#), [393](#)
- Tripolitania, [330](#)
- Trissonia, [151](#)
- Troyes, 96n
- Tuare, Piero, Venetian armorer (*fl.* 1366), [296](#)
- Tulle, bishop of, *see* Laurent d’Albiars
- Tunis, [107](#), 141n, 167n, [330](#), [338](#), [339](#); “kings” of (rulers of Tunisia), *see* Hafṣids
- Tunisia, [339](#); crusade to (1270), [2](#), [106](#), [107](#); crusade to (1390), [331–340](#), [360](#), [375](#), [384](#); rulers of, *see* Zirids 972–1148, Muwahhids (1148–1230), Hafṣids 1230–1574
- Turcomans, or Turkomans, 241n
- Turenne, viscount of, *see* G. Roger (III)
- Turin (Torino), bishops of, [126](#) (Gaufrido de Montanaro 1264–1300), 286n (Bartolommeo d’Este 1362–1364); MS. at, 155n; peace of (1381), [322](#), [326](#), [327](#), [329](#), [366](#), [389](#), [393](#), [396](#), [397](#), [401](#), [403](#), [455](#)
- Turkey, [204](#), [217](#), [230](#), [237](#), [252](#), [264](#), [266](#), [287](#), 312n, [344](#), 348n, 360n, [368](#), [377](#), [380](#), [400](#); in Europe, *see* Rumelia; *see also* Anatolia, Turks in
- Turks (“Agarenes”), [1–3](#), [6](#), 33n, [41](#), [61](#), [73](#), [85](#), [88](#), [97](#), [99](#), 100n, [121](#), 127n, [137](#), [143](#), [144](#), [146](#), [149](#), [154](#), [159](#), [160](#), [162–164](#), [166](#), [177](#), [179–204](#), [206–239](#), [243–246](#), [248](#), [258–260](#), [264](#), [275](#), [279](#), [280](#), [285–291](#), [293](#), [298–300](#), [302](#), [306](#), [307](#), [309](#), [311–318](#), [320–329](#), [341–346](#), [348–359](#), [361](#), [362](#), [364](#), [367](#), [370–382](#), [386](#), [400](#), [404](#), 408n, [425](#), [437](#), [441](#), [446](#), [448–451](#), 453n, [454–456](#), [458–461](#), [463](#), [465](#), [468](#), [471–473](#), and *see* Ottomans, Seljuks, Turcomans
- Turnu-Severin, [348](#)
- Tuscany (Toscana), [50](#), [147](#), [169](#), 173n, [193](#), [231](#), [254](#); soldiers from, [452](#); vicariate of, [133](#)
- Tusculum, cardinal-bishops of, *see* G. Court, Bessarion; *see also* John XXI
- Tvrtko I, ruler of Bosnia 1353–1391: [344](#)
- Tyre (Sūr), 96n, [106](#), [108](#)
- Tyrol, Austrian, [366](#)
- Tyrrhenian Sea, [330](#)
- Tzakones (Laconians), [26](#), [63](#), [68](#)
- Tzepaena, [62](#), [72](#), [73](#)
- Tzurulum (Chorlu), [18](#), [57](#)
- Ugolino de Malabranca, archbishop of Spalato 1349–1388: [289](#)
- Unavi, [346](#)
- Umur (Pasha), son of Mehmed; emir of Aydin 1334–1348: [181–183](#), [189](#), [191](#), [192](#), 193n, [194](#), [207](#), [209](#), [211–216](#)
- Union of the Churches, [1](#), [2](#), [3n](#), [4](#), [14](#), 41, 58n, 65, 70, [77](#), [84](#), [95](#), [98–102](#), [106–110](#), 111n, 112n, [115–122](#), [124](#), [125](#), 126n, 129–[132](#), [134](#), [135](#), [138](#), [143](#), [177](#), [189](#), [213](#), [214](#), [224–226](#), [228](#), [229](#), 280n, [289](#), [295](#), [306](#), [308](#), [309–311](#), [313](#), [315](#), [320](#), [329](#), [424](#), [425](#)
- Urban II (Odo of Lagery), pope 1088–1099: [1](#), [108](#)
- Urban IV (Jacques Pantaléon), pope 1261–1264: 93n, [95](#), [96](#), [98–102](#), [107](#), [108](#), [112](#), [123](#), 138n, [166](#), [420](#)
- Urban V (Guillaume de Grimoard), pope 1362–1370: [173](#), [176](#), [177](#), [187](#), 232n, 233n, [238](#), [243–253](#), [255](#), [258–263](#), 264n, 267n, [272–277](#), [279](#), [280](#), [282](#), [283](#), [285–291](#), [294](#), [306](#), [308–311](#), [313–315](#), [317](#), [319](#), [327](#), [456–459](#), [463](#), [468n](#), [470](#)
- Urban VI (Bartolommeo Prignani), pope 1378–1389: 173n, [331](#), 333n, 342n, 463n, [468](#), [469](#), [471](#)
- Urbino, [172](#), [231](#)
- Urtières, lord of, *see* Antelme
- Uzès, [232](#)
- Vabres, bishop of, *see* Pierre d’Aigrefeuille
- Valaincourt, Frankish baronial family, [417](#)
- Valania (Bāniyās), [279](#)
- Valencia, 62n, [383](#), [391](#); kingdom of, [467](#)
- Valenciennes, *see* Henri de Valenciennes
- Valentinois, count of, [285](#)
- Vallaresso, Giacomo, Venetian envoy (in 1392), [339](#)
- Valois, house of, [2](#), [181](#), and *see* Catherine, Charles, and Isabelle of Valois, Philip (VI of France)
- Valona, *see* Avlona
- Varambon, lord of, *see* Pierre de la Palu
- Vardar (Axius or Naxius), river, 17n, [35](#), [45](#), [62](#), [74](#), [75](#), [81](#)
- Varna, [303](#), [305](#)
- Varouchas, Greek archontic family in Crete, 178n
- Vasilipotamo, [380](#), [381](#), [384](#)

- Vatatzes, *see* John III (Ducas) Vatatzes
- Vatican, palace (at Rome), [133](#), [134n](#), [176](#), [177](#); archives of, [129](#), [146](#), [148](#), [176](#), [187](#), [313](#), [466](#); registers of, [168n](#)
- Vatondas, [427](#)
- Veglia (Krk), [404](#)
- Velbuzd (Küstendil), [62](#)
- Veles, [62](#), [74n](#)
- Velestino, lord of, *see* Berthold I
- Veligosti, [25](#), [26](#), [31](#), [79](#), [127](#); Latin bishops of, [38](#); lords of, *see* William and Jacques de la Roche
- Vélines, archpriest of (Arnaud de Cervole), [232](#)
- Velletri, cardinal-bishops of, *see* Ostia and Velletri
- Vendramin, Venetian family, [323](#)
- Vendramin, Andrea, Venetian (*fl.* 1370), [284](#)
- Veneto, [166](#), [254](#), [325](#), [364](#)
- Venice (Venezia), [7](#), [9](#), [34](#), [49](#), [78](#), [79n](#), [80n](#), [135](#), [137n](#), [144](#), [145](#), [150n](#), [177](#), [183n](#), [190](#), [191](#), [193](#), [197–200](#), [202](#), [204](#), [205n](#), [210](#), [212](#), [213](#), [215n](#), [216](#), [219](#), [227](#), [232](#), [236](#), [242](#), [243](#), [245n](#), [246n](#), [249n](#), [250–256](#), [260–263](#), [264n](#), [273](#), [275](#), [278](#), [279](#), [281](#), [283](#), [284](#), [287](#), [293–296](#), [299n](#), [300](#), [307–309](#), [312](#), [315](#), [316](#), [319–326](#), [339](#), [343](#), [346](#), [347](#), [357](#), [360](#), [363](#), [365](#), [366](#), [372](#), [377–379](#), [381](#), [383](#), [390–401](#), [430](#), [431](#), [451](#), [453n](#), [471](#), [472](#); bishops of, *see* Castello, bishops of; individuals from, [356](#), and *see* Paolo da Venezia; merchants from, [2](#), [6](#), [167](#), [294](#), [344](#), [364](#); MS. at, [155n](#)
- Venice, republic of, [7](#), [12n](#), [17](#), [19](#), [28n](#), [34–36](#), [37n](#), [68](#), [78–80](#), [96n](#), [99](#), [111](#), [134n](#), [146](#), [149](#), [152](#), [154](#), [159](#), [165–168](#), [170](#), [177](#), [178](#), [180–185](#), [195–202](#), [210](#), [216](#), [218–222](#), [224](#), [227](#), [229](#), [231](#), [236](#), [239](#), [240](#), [242](#), [249–252](#), [254](#), [255](#), [258](#), [259](#), [260n](#), [262–264](#), [274](#), [276–279](#), [281–283](#), [287–293](#), [312](#), [314](#), [317](#), [318](#), [320–326](#), [328](#), [342–344](#), [346](#), [347](#), [357–359](#), [365](#), [367–369](#), [377–380](#), [382](#), [384n](#), [388–404](#), [412](#), [428](#), [430–432](#), [448–451](#), [453–455](#), [471](#), [472](#); doges of, [9](#), [10n](#), [19](#), [56](#), [79](#), and *see* E. Dandolo 1192–1205, P. Ziani 1205–1229, J. Tiepolo 1229–1249, R. Zeno 1253–1268, L. Tiepolo 1268–1275, J. Contarini 1275–1280, G. Dandolo 1280–1289, P. Gradenigo 1289–1311, G. Soranzo 1312–1328, F. Dandolo 1329–1339, B. Gradenigo 1339–1342, A. Dandolo 1343–1354, M. Falier 1354–1355, G. Gradenigo 1355–1356, G. Dolfín 1356–1361, L. Celsi 1361–1365, M. Corner 1365–1368, A. Contarini 1368–1382, M. Morosini 1382, A. Venier 1382–1400, M. Steno 1400–1413, T. Mocenigo 1414–1423; possessions of, [33](#), [38](#), [357](#), [371](#), and *see* Coron, Modon, Negroponte; ships of, [44](#), [55–57](#), [92–95](#), [100](#), [135](#), [144](#), [151](#), [163](#), [166](#), [177–180](#), [184](#), [185](#), [188n](#), [191](#), [198](#), [200–202](#), [205–207](#), [209](#), [210](#), [212](#), [216](#), [220](#), [222](#), [230](#), [231](#), [236](#), [240](#), [249](#), [251](#), [253](#), [258](#), [262](#), [267](#), [273](#), [276–278](#), [280–283](#), [287–292](#), [294](#), [295](#), [302](#), [303](#), [320](#), [325](#), [326](#), [329](#), [343](#), [344](#), [346](#), [347](#), [350n](#), [356–359](#), [364](#), [371](#), [378–385](#), [387–397](#), [402](#), [404](#), [426](#)
- Venier, Andrea, Venetian consul (in 1365), [262n](#), [269](#)
- Venier, Antonio, doge of Venice 1382–1400: [324](#), [325](#), [339](#), [358](#), [359](#), [363n](#), [366](#), [367](#), [372n](#)
- Venier, Marino, Venetian envoy (in 1366), [274](#), [276](#)
- Venier, Tito, rebel in Crete (*fl.* 1364), [255](#)
- Venieri, Venetian family in Crete, [249](#), [254](#), [255](#)
- Venosa, [234](#)
- Vento, Pietro, Italian baron (*fl.* 1208), [27n](#)
- Venturino da Bergamo, Dominican preacher (*fl.* 1343), [190](#)
- Vercelli, [308n](#)
- Vernon, Francis, English traveler (*fl.* 1675), [420n](#)
- Veroli, bishop of, *see* Leoterio
- Verona, [172](#), [188](#), [197](#), [204](#), [210n](#), [213](#), [243](#), [396](#); individuals from, [36](#), [79](#), [254](#), and *see* Beatrice, Boniface, Felisa, Francesco, Giberto [\(2\)](#), Guglielmo [\(2\)](#), Marulla, and Thomas of Verona; lords of, *see* Scaligeri
- Veteranitz, [439](#), [444](#), [451](#), [454](#), [471](#)
- Veyrol, Domenico, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [301n](#), [304](#)
- Via Egnatia, [44](#), [109](#)
- Vibod, Pierre, crusader (in 1366), [302n](#)
- Vicemano, Jacopo, Venetian skipper (*fl.* 1383), [325](#)
- Vicenza, [243](#), [372](#), [396](#), [425](#)
- Vidal de Villanova, Catalan envoy to Avignon (in 1309), [163](#), [175](#)
- Vidin, [287](#), [288](#), [300](#), [301](#), [303](#), [304](#), [306](#), [348](#), [349](#)
- Vienna (Wien), [260n](#), [347](#), [348](#)
- Vienne, *see* Jean de Vienne; coinage of, [152](#); Council of (1312), [168n](#), [170](#), [446](#), [447](#)
- Viennois, [293](#), [302](#); dauphin of, *see* Humbert II 1333–1349; governor of, [285](#); *see also* Dauphiné
- Vieste, [90n](#)
- Vignoso, Simone, Genoese admiral (*fl.* 1346), [206](#), [207](#)
- Villani, Giovanni, Florentine historian (d. 1348), [139](#), [182n](#), [193](#), [199](#)
- Villani, Matteo, Florentine chronicler (d. 1363), [211](#)
- Villehardouin, Champenois family, [19n](#), [31](#), [35](#), [51](#), [68](#), [83](#), [103](#), [104](#), [127](#), [143](#), [148](#), [152](#), [432](#), and *see* Geoffrey [\(3\)](#), Isabelle, Marguerite, and William of Villehardouin
- Villeneuve (near Nogent), [360](#)
- Villeneuve-lès-Avignon, [175](#), [176](#), [185](#), [220](#), [243](#), [244](#), [469](#)
- Vincent of Beauvais, Dominican anthologist (d. 1264?), [97](#)
- Vincenti, Ettore, Genoese skipper (*fl.* 1366), [295n](#), [302](#)
- Virtù, count of, *see* G. G. Visconti
- Visan, [196](#)
- Visconti, ducal family at Milan 1277–1447 and at Pavia: [172](#), [187](#), [188](#), [197](#), [231](#), [247](#), [253](#), [291](#), [292](#), [327](#), [329](#), and *see* Gregory X (Tedraldo Visconti)
- Visconti, Bernabò, brother of Galeazzo II; tyrant of Milan 1354–1385: [232n](#), [243](#), [246–248](#), [260](#), [279n](#), [291](#)
- Visconti, Filippo Maria, son of Gian Galeazzo; count of Pavia 1402–1412, duke of Milan 1412–1447: [398](#)
- Visconti, Galeazzo II, nephew of Lucchino; tyrant of Pavia 1354–1378: [291–294](#), [305](#), [307](#); wife of, *see* Blanche of Savoy
- Visconti, Gian Galeazzo, son of Galeazzo II; tyrant of Pavia 1378–1402, of Milan 1385–1395, duke of Milan 1395–1402: [291–293](#), [332](#), [340](#), [346](#), [347](#), [360n](#), [375](#), [396](#); sons of, [291n](#); wife of, *see* Isabelle of Valois
- Visconti, Gian Galeazzo, son of Gian Galeazzo and Isabelle (b. 1366, d. 1376), [291](#), [292](#)
- Visconti, Gianmario, son of Gian Galeazzo; duke of Milan 1402–1412: [398](#)
- Visconti, Giovanni, brother of Lucchino; archbishop of Milan 1342–1354, tyrant 1349–1354: [190](#), [204](#), [210n](#)
- Visconti, Lucchino, tyrant of Milan 1339–1349: [204](#), [210n](#)
- Visconti, Valentina, daughter of Gian Galeazzo and Isabelle; wife of Louis I of Orléans (from *ca.* 1389), [291n](#), [332](#), [347n](#)
- Viterbo, [63](#), [82n](#), [95](#), [103–106](#), [108](#), [126](#), [128](#), [133](#), [134](#), [135n](#), [176](#), [177n](#), [308](#), [309](#), and *see* Marco da Viterbo; treaty of (1267), [103–105](#), [143](#), [148](#), [152](#), [433](#), [437](#)
- Vizya (Bizye), [73](#)
- Vlachia, *see* Thessaly, Wallachia
- Vlachs, [85](#), [87](#), [88](#), [346](#), [348](#), [353–355](#), [367](#), [379](#); tsars of, *see* Asenids
- Vladislav (Ladislas) Jagiello, grand duke of Lithuania 1382–1401, king of Poland 1386–1434: [344](#)
- Vodena (Edessa), [69](#), [75](#), [81](#), [82n](#), [85](#)
- Voghera, [243](#)

- Voleron, 83
 Volga, river, 61, 108n
 Volos, 53; Gulf of, 22n, 53, 60, 69n, 82, 424
 Vonitza, 90, 435, 452
 Vostitza (Aegium, Aigion), 439; barony of, 31, 154; lords of, *see* Niccolò and Nerio I Acciajuoli
 Voyusa, river, 81, 136
 Vrachori (Agrinion), 435
 Vranas, Alexius, Byzantine diplomat (*fl.* 1401), 370, 372–374
- Wales, 409
 Wallachia (Vlachia), 349; voivodes of, *see* Ladislaus, Mircea
 Walsingham, Thomas, English chronicler (*d. ca.* 1422), 274n
 War of the Eight Saints (1376–1378), 173, 329
 Warasdin (Varazdin), 347
 Warin, *see* Garinus
 Warwick, earl of, *see* T. Beauchamp
 Wenceslas (of Luxemburg), son of Charles IV; king (IV) of Bohemia 1363–1419, of Germany 1376–1378, emperor (uncrowned) 1378–1400 (*d.* 1419), 358
 Westminster, 246
 Westphalia, 171, 268n
 William, *see also* Guglielmo, Guillaume
 William II, king of Sicily 1166–1189: 3, 141
 William, lord of Larissa (in 1215), 40
 William de Almenara, captain and castellan of Livadia before 1370–*ca.* 1380: 445
 William de la Pole, lord of Castle Ashby (*fl.* 1366), 253
 William de la Roche, son of Guy I; lord of Livadia, duke (I) of Athens 1280–1287, bailie of Achaea 1285–1287: 422n, 423, 427, 432, 433, 441; wife of, *see* Helena (Ducaena)
 William de la Roche, brother of Guy I; lord of Veligosti and Damala 1256–1264: 79, 80, 417, 420n
 William of Beaujeu, master of the Templars 1273–1291: 113
 William of Moerbeke, Dominican; Latin archbishop of Corinth 1278–1286: 115
 William of Ockham, Franciscan theologian (*d.* 1349), 172
 William of Randazzo, son of Frederick II of Sicily; duke (II) of Athens 1317–1338: 453
 William of Villehardouin, son of Geoffrey I; prince (II) of Achaea 1246–1278: 31, 36n, 38, 49, 50, 68–70, 77–80, 82–84, 86–89, 91, 92n, 98–100, 102–105, 112n, 127, 131, 143, 148, 153, 154n, 420–425, 427, 431–433; wife of, *see* Anna (Ducaena)
 Wittelsbach, Bavarian imperial family, 172, 173, *and see* Ludwig IV
 Wyclif, John, English reformer (*d.* 1384), 173
- Xanthia, 52
 Xeros, Leo, Orthodox metropolitan of Athens (*d.* 1153), 22n
 Xyleas, Byzantine official (*fl.* 1257), 74–76
- Yakhshi, emir of Karasi (in 1334), 182
 Yelbogha al-Khāssikī, Mamluk regent of Egypt (*d.* 1366), 266, 277, 278
 Yolanda (“Irene”) of Montferrat, granddaughter of Boniface II; wife of Andronicus II Palaeologus 1284–1316: 440
 Yolande of Bar, daughter of Robert; wife of John I of Aragon-Catalonia 1384–1395 (*d.* 1431), 464n
- Yolande, sister of Henry d’Angre; wife of Peter of Courtenay 1193–1219, Latin empress of Constantinople 1217–1219: 44, 45
 Yorkshire, 398
 Ypres, 402
- Zaccaria, Genoese family in the Archipelago and Morea, 206
 Zaccaria, Venetian family, 323
 Zaccaria, Bartolommeo, Genoese (*fl.* 1330), 454; wife of, *see* Guglielma Pallavicini
 Zaccaria, Benedetto, Italian diplomat (*fl.* 1279), 138
 Zaccaria, Centurione I, son of Martino; Genoese captain (in 1345), lord of Chalandritsa (in 1361), 202, 203, 208, 210n
 Zaccaria, Centurione II, grandson of Centurione I; lord of Arcadia 1401–1432, prince of Achaea 1404–1430 (*d.* 1432), 162
 Zaccaria, Maria, daughter of Centurione I; wife of Pedro “Bordo” de San Superano (to 1402), regent of Achaea 1402–1404: 162
 Zaccaria, Martino, Genoese co-lord of Chios 1314–1329 (*d.* 1345), 180n, 181, 186, 187n, 190–194, 202, 203, 214, 217, 218
 Zaccaria, Marulla, daughter of Bartolommeo and Guglielma; wife of John Fadrique (from 1350), 454
 Zaccaria, Ottaviano, Genoese (*fl.* 1348), 214, 217, 218
 Zane, Andrea, Venetian podestà of Treviso (in 1362), 242
 Zanobi della Strada, Florentine humanist (*d.* 1361), 232n, 236n
 Zante (Zacynthus), 3, 37n, 38, 319n, 381; lords of, *see* Cephalonia
 Zara (Zadar), 5n, 8, 10, 13, 197–201, 228, 254n, 286, 297, 307, 356n, 403, 404; archbishop of, *see* Nicholas de Mathafaris; peace of (1358), 307n, 322, 403, 404
 Zaratoria, Latin bishop of, 37, 413, 414
 Zarnata, 26n
 Zawila, 334
 “Zealots,” 183
 Zeitounion (Lamia, Gitone), 28, 45, 87, 424, 432, 438–444, 451, 452n, 454, 471; Latin bishops of, 461, 462, 466; lord of, *see* Rainerio da Travaglia
 Zemena, 36n, 37n, 38
 Zeno, Carlo, Venetian commander (in 1403), 379–385, 387–396
 Zeno, Jacopo, grandson of Carlo; bishop of Feltre and Belluno 1447–1460, of Padua 1460–1481: 385n, 389, 390n
 Zeno, Marino, Venetian podestà at Constantinople 1205–1207: 18n, 29n
 Zeno, Pietro, lord of Andros 1384–1427: 378, 380, 463n
 Zeno, Pietro, Venetian bailie at Negroponte 1331–1333 (*d.* 1345), 179, 180, 182, 185n, 192, 193n, 194, 217
 Zeno, Ranieri, doge of Venice 1253–1268: 70, 79, 80, 91, 96, 100, 431, 432
 Ziani, Niccolò, duke of Crete (in 1318), 177
 Ziani, Pietro, doge of Venice 1205–1229: 35, 37n, 407n
 Zirids, Berber dynasty in Tunisia 972–1148: 331
 Ziyānids (Banū ‘Abd-al-Wād), Berber dynasty in western Algeria 1236–1556: 330
 Zonklon, *see* Port-de-Jonc
 Zorzi, *see* Giorgio

Constantinopolis



THE PAPACY
and
THE LEVANT
(1204–1571)

Volume I

The Thirteenth and
Fourteenth Centuries

THIS is the first of three volumes which will trace the history of the later Crusades and papal relations with the Levant from the accession of Innocent III (in 1198) to the reign of Pius V and the battle of Lepanto (1566–1571). From the mid-fourteenth century to the conclusion of his work the author has drawn heavily upon unpublished materials, collected in the course of seventeen "palaeographical journeys" to the Archivio Segreto Vaticano and the Archivi di Stato in Venice, Mantua, Modena, Milan, Siena, and Florence, and the Archives of the Order of the Hospitallers at Malta.

In 1957 Mr. Setton was awarded the John Frederick Lewis Prize by the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, and in 1976 the Premi Catalònia by the Institut d'Estudis Catalans in Barcelona as well as the Prix Gustave Schlumberger by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in Paris. He is Professor Emeritus of History at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey.

THE AMERICAN
PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
104 South Fifth Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

ISBN 0-87169-114-0



9 780871 691149